

VOLUME XX

OCTOBER, 1922

NUMBER 4

FLS 9 1 1922
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Princeton Theological Review

CONTENTS

Yet Another Criticism of the Theory of Evolution	537
WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.	
Is God Almighty?	562
WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON	
The Fossils as Age-Markers in Geology	585
GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE	
Peter Martyr and the Colloquy of Poissy (Cont.)	616
BENJAMIN F. PAIST, JR.	
The Justification of Capitalism	647
W. M. CLOW	
Notes and Notices	661
Ezekiel's Sanctuary and Wellhausen's Theory, C. M. MACKAY	
Reviews of Recent Literature	666
Survey of Periodical Literature	695

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1922

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR
THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BY
OSWALD T. ALLIS

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article
Notice of discontinuance must be sent to the Publishers; otherwise subscriptions will be continued
Subscriptions \$2.00 a year, 60 cents a copy, for the U. S. A. and Canada
Foreign postage 50 cents additional
Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at Princeton, N. J.

BOOKS REVIEWED

ALEXANDER, H. B., <i>The Mythology of All Races: XI. Latin-American</i>	693
BAKER, E. D., and C. B., <i>The Bible in Graded Story</i>	689
BERTHOLET, A., <i>Kulturgeschichte Israels</i>	674
BETTS, A. F., <i>The Mother Teacher of Religion</i>	690
BETTS, G. H., <i>The New Program of Religious Education</i>	689
BROWN, C. R., <i>The Religion of a Layman</i>	685
BUTTENWIESER, M., <i>The Book of Job</i>	671
CADMAN, S. P., <i>Ambassadors of God</i>	685
CANNEY, M. A., <i>An Encyclopedia of Religion</i>	668
CLARKE, J. E., <i>Education for Successful Living</i>	690
COLGROVE, K., <i>The American Citizens and their Government</i>	692
DEWULF, M., <i>Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages</i>	666
ECKENSTEIN, L., <i>A History of Sinai</i>	672
FRAZER, J. W., <i>The Untried Civilization</i>	692
HOUGH, L. H., <i>The Eyes of Faith</i>	685
LINDBERG, C. E., <i>Christian Dogmatics and Notes on the History of Dogma</i>	682
MCCONNELL, F. J., <i>Public Opinion and Theology</i>	683
MILLER, P. H., <i>Our Reasonable Faith</i>	683
NICOLL, W. R., <i>Princes of the Church</i>	687
ROBINSON, A. P., <i>The Wonderful Christ</i>	687
SCHOFF, W. H., <i>The Ship "Tyre," A Study in the Commerce of the Bible</i>	678
SCHUMACHER, H., <i>Christus in seiner Präexistenz und Kenose nach Phil. 2, 5-8</i>	680
SCHUMACHER, H., <i>Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Matt. 11, 27 (Luc 10, 22)</i>	678
SIMPSON, H. L., <i>The Intention of His Soul: Essays for the Untheologically Minded</i>	684
SNOWDEN, J. H., <i>The Meaning of Education</i>	689
STAERK, W., <i>Lyrick (Psalmen, Hoheslied und Verwandtes), übersetzt und erklärt</i>	678
STERRETT, J. M., <i>Modernism in Religion</i>	682
STOCKDALE, F. B., <i>The Future Life, Fact and Fancies</i>	669
STOUT, J. E., <i>Organization and Administration of Religious Education</i>	690
STRONG, A. H., <i>What Shall I Believe? A Primer of Christian Theology</i>	681
TRACY, F., <i>The Psychology of Adolescence</i>	689
TWEEDY, H. H., BEACH, H. P. and MCKINN, J. J., <i>Christian Work as a Vocation</i>	691
VOLZ, P., <i>Hiob und Weisheit (Das Buch Hiob, Sprüche, Jesus Sirach, Prediger) übersetzt und erklärt</i>	678
WANLASS, W. L., <i>A Study in Agriculture</i>	693
WHYTE, A., <i>Lord, Teach us to Pray</i>	688
WILLIAMS, H. B., <i>Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought</i>	669

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1922

YET ANOTHER CRITICISM OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

Such criticisms are called for and are even demanded by the general and the lively interest in the subject. The questions as to the truth and as to the significance of evolution are no longer merely academic ones. Persons of all classes and in almost all places are thinking and even talking of it. They ought, therefore, to receive the guidance which they need and want. To give it, consequently, is the duty of all capable teachers, whether scientific or philosophical or theological. Sincere inquiry must be aided along all possible lines. Specially is this so when the matter of interest is bound to exert a mighty practical influence, and particularly if it create an atmosphere which affects even those not conscious of breathing it. Now it is thus with the "theory of evolution." Its world-view, because of its monism, is both at first so attractive and afterwards so compelling that, if yielded to, it must at last revolutionize civilization. The most serious aspect of all this is that the influence of evolution, whether for good or for ill, is strongest in the most important of all spheres, that of religion. It is bound to determine our conception of God and of man and of duty and of sin and of destiny. There are many who say that its establishment as fact means the collapse of Christianity and even of religion in general. There are others who declare that such establishment, while destructive of Christianity, will redound to the perfection of true religion. Under these conditions no honest criticism of the theory of evolution can be superfluous. The deepening interest in it, the practical significance of it, its influence on religion, and above all on Christianity, confirm this judgment.

I. What, then, do we mean by Evolution? As used in this paper and as generally understood, Evolution is that hypothesis of the universe which stands in contrast with the idea of special acts of creation, immediate interpositions of supernatural power. It teaches that the world has been gradually unfolded through immeasurable past time by natural causes alone. Its logical conclusion and its actual claim is that all that exists, organic as well as inorganic, animate as well as inanimate, spiritual as well as physical, is to be explained simply as the natural and so necessary development of an original germ. All this applies to man. Adam was not created by God "in his image and after his likeness." He was developed naturally, many would say, accidentally, from some lower species of animal as that from one lower yet. This is what is meant by "the descent of man," a phrase that evolutionists are fond of using. "The fundamental postulate," then, "of this theory, as it respects man, is the unbroken continuity of life from its first appearance on the earth; and, therefore, the present arrangement of living things must be the outcome of an unimaginably long series of past changes, not only of those produced by the evolutionary process, but also the countless changes of climate and geography which have continually altered the possibility of migration in this or that direction."¹ Thus the characteristic contention of the evolutionist is both that the universe is "a continuous development," and that it is "a continuous development" *only*. Logically the hypothesis is a godless one; it enthrones evolution in the room of God, a natural process in place of the Supernatural Being. All this calls for a further question: What is meant by speaking of evolution as a "theory" rather than as an hypothesis? This: it expresses the evolutionist's judgment of his hypothesis. It signifies that in the view of the evolutionist this is not a mere hypothesis, ingenious and promising, it may be, but wholly unproved. On the contrary, he regards it as a

¹ William Berryman Scott, *The Theory of Evolution*, p. 122.

theory, i.e., a highly probable hypothesis, as one which, though not yet shown to be a fact, looks as though it were about to be so proved, as one "in favor of which is the whole trend of scientific opinion"² "Whatever," says Professor Scott, an evolutionist who rivals Darwin himself in caution, in accuracy, in candor,—“whatever may be the private opinion of a greater or less number of naturalists on the question of evolution, almost the only zoologist of recognized standing who has taken a pronounced and positive position against the theory is Professor Fleischmann of Erlangen.”³ It is, then, a view no less confidently and honorably held than this that we are called on to examine and, it may be, to dispute.

II. In spite of this so general and so intelligent acceptance, "the theory of evolution" lacks the simplicity and the consistency that usually characterize truth. This is evident at a glance as regards simplicity. There are almost as many modifications of "the theory of evolution" as there are exponents of it. Thus, while Darwin begins with life, Haeckel would evolve it; while not a few would derive mind from matter, others, as Romanes, hold to two parallel streams of development, the one physical, the other mental; while Spencer insists on the transmission from parent to child of acquired characteristics, Weismann and most of the Neo-Darwinians restrict evolution to what is essential to the species; while many, as Darwin, believe the use to which organs are put to be the result of accidental variations in their structure, others, as Lamarck and Cope, teach that the structure of organs is determined by their use; while some, as Darwin, magnify sexual selections, others, as Wallace, minimize it; while most hold to a uniform process of development, not a few, as Professor Hugo de Vries, are taking the position that evolution is by widely separated jumps, which are so sudden and so definite as to seem to imply special creation; while probably a majority still em-

² *Ibid.* p. I.

³ *Ibid.* p. I.

phasize natural selection as the method of evolution, many are repudiating it,⁴ and there has lately been substituted for it by Bergson what he calls "creative evolution," what the Darwinian would describe as evolution without anything to evolve, what the theologian might speak of as creation without a Creator. While these and other modifications do not, it is true, change the general bearing of the so-called theory, they do keep it from being more than an hypothesis; and it is well, at the outset, to observe that, even as an hypothesis, it is exceedingly indeterminate. It lacks the simplicity that is the earmark of truth.

Nor is it otherwise as regards consistency. This is indispensable, if a theory or even an hypothesis is to lay claim to truth. Yet the positions which the evolutionists take in order to validate the general theory are conspicuously inconsistent. It is necessary only to recite a few of them for this to appear. Thus the Neo-Lamarckians depend for evolution on environmental factors, while the Ultra-Darwinians maintain the sufficiency of "natural selection." The former insist on the inheritance of acquired characteristics, while the latter as resolutely deny it. Hence, as Dr. Herbert remarks,⁵ "The difficulties of either of these extreme schools are very great indeed when taken singly, each side being able to make out an exceedingly strong case against the other"; and yet, as should be added, they are mutually exclusive and so cannot be combined.

Again, take the auxiliary hypotheses that have been devised in aid of natural selection and the Darwinians, such as "panmixia," "germinal selection," "coincident selection," and "isolation." These hypotheses may not be exclusive of each other, speaking strictly; but are they not admitted to rest on only a small basis of fact? Are they not but so many guesses? Do they not, by their number, as well as by their futility, emphasize at least their purely con-

⁴ William Berryman Scott, *The Theory of Evolution*, p. 25.

⁵ *First Principles of Evolution*, p. 173.

jectural character; and is not mere conjecture, at any rate, almost as foreign to truth as is contradiction?

Once more, take the two modern schools of Heterogenesis and of Orthogenesis. The former "look upon discontinuous variation as the material of organic evolution," while the latter assume "a determinate progressive movement in the organic world as an intrinsic part of its organization." Neither of these theories, however, can be regarded as supplementing the two older ones. Heterogenesis emphasizes the discontinuity of variations, whereas the point of the older theories is that they emphasize the continuity of variations; and "orthogenesis insists on "a determinate progressive movement in the organic world as an intrinsic part of its organization," whereas the older theories resort to accidental variations in the organism or in the environment. Heterogenesis lays stress on single variations or "sports": orthogenesis, on the contrary, falls back on an "inherent growth of the organism." The method of the one could not be more opposed than it is to that of the other.

Nor is the case different when we compare the two schools that hold to orthogenesis. These are as exclusive in their fundamental principles as Mechanism and Vitalism. And the same is strikingly true of the vitalists themselves. They divide into two camps, one holding to purpose, the other, as Bergson, denying it. But why go further? Even at the outset of our inquiry a mere glance reveals the theory of evolution as at least embarrassed by complexity and inconsistency.

III. More careful examination discloses the fact that what has been the most influential school of Evolution, that is, Darwinism, is "in collapse." The distinction here implied is important. All Darwinians are evolutionists, but not all evolutionists are Darwinians. The two terms are not synonymous, though often used as if they were. Evolution, as has been pointed out, is that theory of the universe which would account for it as an uninterrupted

development and that only, whereas Darwinism is the Darwinian explanation of this development by "natural selection" or "the survival of the fittest," meaning by the fittest the best adapted to environment. Now this school of evolutionists is "in collapse," and this position is justified on the following grounds:

1. The unsatisfactory nature of the evidence for Darwinism and, indeed, for evolution in general. This evidence is asserted or admitted to be mainly subjective. Thus Professor Fleischmann of Erlangen writes:⁶ "The more deeply I pursued the alleged evidence of it [the theory] and sought to gain, through special investigation, some essential proof of the genetic relationships of animals, the more clearly I recognized that the theory is a seductive romance, which deceptively pretends to give results and explanations rather than a doctrine based upon positive foundations." Moreover, this judgment is not only that of an admitted and committed opponent of the theory of Evolution or Descent in general as well as of its Darwinian explanation; but also and most significantly it is the estimate of one who, though a sharp critic of Darwinism, is one of the ablest American expounders and upholders of the theory of Evolution or of Descent. The reference is to Professor Vernon L. Kellogg⁷ and his position is the following: "What may for the moment detain us is the curiously nearly completely subjective character of the evidence for both the theory of descent and that of natural selection. Biology has been until now a science of observation; it is beginning to be one of observation plus experiment. The evidence for its principal theories might be expected to be thoroughly objective in character, to be of the nature of positively observed and, perhaps experimentally proved fact. How is it actually? Speaking by and large, we only tell the general truth when we declare that no indubitable cases of species-forming or transforming, that is, of descent, have been

⁶ Albert Fleischmann, *Die Descendenztheorie*, p. III.

⁷ *Darwinism To-Day*, p. 18.

observed; and that no recognized case of natural selection really selecting has been observed. I hasten to repeat the names of the Ancon sheep, the Paraguay cattle, the Porto Santo rabbit, the Artemias of Schmankewitch, and the de Vriesian evening primroses to show that I know my list of classic possible exceptions to this denial of observed species-forming; and to refer to Weldon's broad-and-narrow-fronted crabs as a case of what may be an observation of selection at work. But such a list, even if it could be extended to a score, or to a hundred, of cases, is ludicrous as objective proof of that descent and selection under whose domination the formation of millions of species is supposed to have occurred." In a word, for both the general "Theory of Evolution" and the Darwinian form of it the evidence offered is largely subjective. It may rest on but it does not consist in facts verified by observation and experiment. As Professor William Berryman Scott says,⁸ such "complete and indubitable proof" as that would be is "in the very nature of the case unattainable." What creature of a day, as we are, could observe what happened millions of years ago and was millions of years in the happening? But this being so, must it not be admitted that the certainty which is the result of indubitable proof is unattainable with respect to the theory under consideration? Logical and in so far forth satisfactory as far as it goes, and the only purely naturalistic view of the world that is so, it is still but a more or less probable hypothesis. It has not been, and it cannot be, verified by facts, and that in the nature of the case this could not be only makes the fact that it cannot be itself more significant. It would seem to warrant the conclusion that Evolution in general and Darwinism in particular could never be a theory, but must always remain only a more or less probable hypothesis.

2. The metaphysical foundation of Darwinism is another and a fatal objection to it. It is impossible as a foundation.

⁸ *The Theory of Evolution*, p. 2.

It is that design can result from accident. In common with the evolution theory in general; i.e., the theory of descent, Darwin's doctrine is that "a primordial germ with no inherent intelligence, develops, under purely natural influences, into all the infinite variety of vegetable and animal organisms with all their complicated relations to each other and to the world around them,"⁹ and thus realizes the plan evident in nature and always assumed and sometimes named by Darwin himself. Nor is this all. This same primordial germ develops at last into man and into everything that is in man or proceeds from him. The distinctively Darwinian element in this theory of descent appears when we inquire as to the cause and process of the development. It goes on absolutely without the intervention of mind anywhere; and it finds its explanation in what is called Natural Selection or the Survival of the Fittest. This un-intelligent selection it is which, as the result of the interaction of the general laws of heredity and of variation, and of struggle for existence determines necessarily all things. That must survive and develop which is best fitted for its environment. This is Darwinism in a nutshell. Let us try to get it clearly before us. It is not that God has by his almighty power and his infinite wisdom himself developed all things, however dissimilar, out of one primordial germ. It might be urged that that was unlikely: it could not be said that it was irrational; there would be in God an adequate cause. Nor is the theory that God created an intelligent germ, and then left the intelligence in it to develop his plan for it. It might be affirmed that that was a difficult theory: it could not be maintained that it was an impossible one; God could have endowed the original germ with intelligence equal to what was to be evolved. The characteristic of the theory, however, at least in its unmodified form, is the denial of the one condition indispensable to its being reasonable. The intelligence that it presupposes, unless results are to be conceived without causes

⁹ *The Descent of Man*, II, p. 396.

and accidental variations are to be regarded as carrying out manifest purpose,—this necessarily presupposed intelligence it explicitly sets aside. The variations on which it depends, by means of which, as has been shown, it works, are assumed to be *accidental*. But this at once makes the theory impossible. Results cannot be conceived without causes, accident cannot be regarded as exhibiting purpose. If we think at all, we must think that every effect has a cause and that purpose invariably and inevitably implies design. These are different forms of self-evident, necessary, universal truth. The only reason why many Darwinians are able to seem to ignore it is that they overlook it. They do not deny it; if they did, they could not think: they dodge it; and so, though they come out in error, they still do think. They are so eager to trace physical resemblances between man and the lower animals that they fail to observe, or rather to appreciate, man's mental and moral uniqueness and especially what these must imply as to their production. Did not their habit of mind and of investigation keep them from being held down to this, they could scarcely help feeling the impossibility of their theory.

Indeed, from the first this has often been felt, and sometimes from quite another than the spiritualistic standpoint. We have a proof of this in an article by Mr. Herbert Spencer in the *Contemporary Review* on "The Inadequacy of Natural Selection." He says, for example, after commenting on the differences in the sense of touch in different parts of the body and inquiring how these differences arise: "Must we not infer that there has been produced in the minds of naturalists the tacit assumption that natural selection can do what artificial selection does—can pick out and select any small advantageous trait; while it can, in fact, pick out no trait, but can only favor the development of traits which, in marked ways, increase the general fitness for the conditions of existence?" What is this but the very criticism which we have been passing? Mr. Spencer's objections to the doctrine of

natural selection are that it assumes, that matter does the work of mind; that it picks out as mind picks out; and thus that its metaphysical background is impossible. Doubtless, he would not consent to this interpretation and use of his question, but this is what it amounts to.

Moreover, if the doctrine of natural selection were not thus impossible as regards its metaphysical background, it would still be inadequate. It itself would yet demand explanation. Grant that development could all be accounted for on the ground of the survival of the fittest, there would still have to be considered the distinct and more difficult question as to "the arrival of the fittest." Whence and how are the differences which constitute the occasion and the reason for selection and survival? Even though natural selection were itself sufficient, it presupposes these variations, if it is to operate; it cannot explain them.

Beyond this and deeper than this is the question as to the arrival of the conditions of the survival of the fittest. As another has well said,¹⁰ "We do not get rid of all evidence of design by showing that animals and man have merely grown to fit the atmosphere in which they found themselves. The question still remains why there happens to be the particular kind of atmosphere, which is the only one out of thousands of equally probable ones that would sustain and develop a high form of life. It is here that we find it difficult to believe that there has been no intelligent mind purposely arranging things in the universe so as to secure a desirable result." Thus the Darwinian hypothesis of natural selection does not solve at all the problem of the development of the universe or of man; it only puts its solution a step further back. Though it proved that all things could be accounted for as the results of natural selection, it would still leave as mysterious as ever the origin of the variations and conditions which both make possible and determine natural selection. The situation would be as in the case of the earth and

¹⁰ *Christian Faith and the New Psychology*, p. 107.

Atlas in the fable. It would not help us to be able to say that the former rested on the shoulders of the latter. What we need most of all to know and what least of all we can tell is, on what does Atlas himself rest. Hence, it is only what was to be expected that our ablest as well as most pronounced evolutionists should write as follows, in the words of Professor William Berryman Scott,¹¹ "While naturalists are all but unanimous in accepting the theory of evolution as an established truth, there is every possible divergence in their views as to the causes of development and diversification. . . . Personally, I have never been satisfied that Darwin's explanation is the rightful one; to one who approaches the problem from the study of fossils, the doctrine of natural selection does not appear to offer an adequate explanation of the observed facts. The doctrine in its application to concrete cases is vague, elastic, unconvincing and seems to leave the whole process to chance." For these and other reasons the hypothesis of natural selection is being widely abandoned, and that, too, by those who hold most tenaciously to the general theory of evolution. It is felt to be better to leave it unexplained than to have recourse to an explanation so impossible and inadequate as natural selection is being admitted to be. Indeed, there has been made, as it were, the official announcement of the collapse of the distinctly Darwinian doctrine of natural selection. We read it in the address of Professor William Bateson as President of The British Association for the Advancement of Science. His words are, "We go to Darwin for his incomparable collection of facts. We would fain emulate his scholarship, his width, and his power of exposition, but to us he speaks no more with philosophic authority."

IV. May it not be, however, that the "theory of evolution" will gain rather than lose by the collapse of Darwinism?

I. It certainly will in so far as it is thus delivered from

¹¹ *The Theory of Evolution*, p. 25.

an hypothesis so inadequate and even so impossible as Darwinism is coming to be regarded. An explanation which does not explain and which cannot explain cannot be thrown overboard too quickly. On the other hand, while it is true, as Professor Scott says,¹² that "it is one thing to accept a fact as substantially proved and quite another thing to devise a satisfactory explanation of the fact"; it is also true that the practical worth of a fact depends in large measure on our understanding of it. We may be sure of the fact of electricity and we may even be able to use it in many and wonderful ways; but who will maintain that it would not mean much more to us and would not be much more useful to us, if we knew the what and the why and the how with respect to it? Precisely so, the theory of evolution will strengthen through the repudiation of Darwinism; but even if we accept "continuous development," and, indeed, in proportion as we accept it, as the ultimate fact and factor of the universe, will it, just because it is so ambitious, call for an explanation in the place of Darwinism. Nor will all this be affected by the fact that *in mysterium exeunt omnia*. It is only by the diligent, the unwearying, search for causes and reasons that mystery can be even pushed back ever further and further.

2. Such an explanation we have, if we take the Supernaturalistic one; and Darwinism being set aside, there is no other of general acceptance.

a. The Supernaturalistic hypothesis meets the necessities of the case. That is, it really accounts for what has to be explained. This is the numerous and striking resemblances between creatures and between things and between creatures and things. These resemblances are so numerous and so striking as at least to suggest the conclusion that they have all been developed, the higher out of the lower. Such is the explanation of the naturalist. He begins with an unintelligent and unexplained process of development, and by

¹² *The Theory of Evolution*, p. 2.

means of the same process he explains all things. He must do so, he holds; for all are so nearly alike.

Now this problem—the supernaturalistic hypothesis, the hypothesis of origination by the fiat of an omniscient and omnipotent, i. e., the Supernatural Being or God—this problem this hypothesis faces squarely. Without perversion or evasion, it, too, undertakes to explain the marvelous unity of the world; and it finds it, not in any mere process, but in an omniscient and omnipotent Being. Thus it accounts for the universe's unity of construction by the unity of God's conception.

But what hypothesis could be more reasonable than this? The products of a man, no matter how many or how varied, usually reflect the individuality of the man. What, then, could be more likely than that one plan should run through and control nature? In proportion as it is regarded as the creation of the one God "in whose image and after whose likeness we have been made," will this seem reasonable, and an externally, because divinely brought about, conformity to type will be taken as accounting for resemblances between organs and between animals, which resemblances would otherwise be inexplicable. To one who admits the activity of the Supernatural such an explanation as that just given would be only what was to be expected. It would be precisely what the facts demanded. Could it have higher commendation?

b. The Supernaturalistic explanation of the pertinent facts of geology and palaeontology not only accepts these as facts; but, so far as it can do this consistently with its supernaturalism, admits the conclusions from these facts. That is, it asserts and maintains "evolution with limits" or "within the type." It holds, for example, that while God created the different species, he formed and perfected the different varieties within these species by providential development, and it allows that many so-called species are but varieties and so have been developed. Hence, while it

affirms that neither by sexual selection, nor by the struggle for existence, nor by adaptation, can a development of morphologically higher species, genera or classes from lower ones be explained; the perfection of particular organs, many physiological changes, the development of new varieties within species,—all these it asserts, are due to a universal process of evolution originated, sustained, and controlled by God, who is immanent in it as well as transcendent above it, and who ordinarily worketh all things through it “according to the counsel of his own will.”

Now what again could be more reasonable than such procedure? Facts admit of no denial. They are determined by the wish and will of God. To deny them is to deny him. The facts on which “the Theory of Evolution” are based are among the most surely ascertained of physical facts. “Classification,” “domestication,” “comparative anatomy,” “embryology and blood tests,” “geographical distribution,” and “experiment,”—these present a body of pertinent and evidential facts which all but fools must take seriously. And the conclusions from these facts may not be lightly disputed. Grant that they are sometimes too sweeping and that they are occasionally far-fetched, it is still difficult to see how they can be set aside and the validity of inductive science not be imperiled. Must it not be, then, to the credit of the supernaturalistic hypothesis that it accepts these facts and is ready fairly to criticize these conclusions? “Continuity of development is too evidently a fact for it, or for the inferences from it, to be ignored.

c. The supernaturalistic hypothesis explains *all* the facts related to it. This the evolutionists often overlook. They fail to see that if continuous development is a fact, it is not the only fact to be considered. There has been continuous development from the beginning. So far the evolutionist is right. There has not been continuous development *only*. This is the great, the fatal, error of the evolutionist. Whether we regard his theory in reference to man alone

or as a theory of origins in general, it thus breaks down just when it should be strongest. It repudiates metaphysics. It appeals solely to objective facts. These, it says, must decide everything; and, lo! the only facts that could *decide* anything are wanting. Its claim is that there has been one continuous development, and this only, from the primordial germ to the most intellectual and most spiritually minded of men, and it would ground this claim on facts and on facts alone. Yet what are the facts?

Those to which they can appeal do, as we have seen, prove a process of development. They prove that many supposed species are not such, but merely varieties that have been developed and that can be further developed. They do more. They are at least consistent with a process of continuous development. The organic world presupposes the inorganic. The animal kingdom presupposes the vegetable kingdom. The human race presupposes the animal kingdom. History presupposes man. In the nature of the facts there is no reason why the higher of these should not have been developed out of the lower; for the higher takes up all in the lower.

This, however, is as far as the facts can carry one. As we have observed, if they prove continuous development; they do not prove that there has been only continuous development. There is more in vital organisms than in inorganic substance. There is more in the animal kingdom than in the vegetable. There is more in man than in animals. There is more in history than in man. The higher is not simply the unfolding of the lower. It is all that and *more*. The question is, whence and what this *more*?

Evolution says, It is the result of development *alone*. Though there is more in life than in mere matter, life is simply a product of matter. Though there is more in the animal than in the vegetable, the animal has come wholly from the vegetable. Though there is more in man than in the animal, man has come wholly from the animal. Though

there is more in history than in man, history is wholly the product of human factors. It can be objected to this, that it denies the metaphysical principle that you can get out of a thing only what is in it, and that every effect demands an adequate cause. We now raise an objection which should be fatal in the estimation of the evolutionists themselves. If their boast is that they appeal only to facts, what can they do when, as in this case, there are not the facts for them to appeal to. If the facts prove that continuous development has done all, then there must be facts showing all stages of development. We must see the atom passing over into force. We must see lifeless matter becoming living matter. We must see vegetables becoming animals. We must see animals becoming men. In a word, we must have the *links* between the different kingdoms. These are the crucial facts.

These, however, are the facts that are wanting. What we do find is, a gap between atoms and primordial forces, and no fact to bridge it; a gap between life and mechanical forces and no fact to bridge it; a gap between the soul of the animal and the unconscious life of the vegetable, and no fact to bridge it; a gap between the rational spirit of man and the irrational soul of the animal, and no fact to bridge it; a gap between the finite spirit of man unless the angels be taken account of, and the Infinite of whom he is conscious, and no fact to bridge it.

Nor is this simply our perversion of the situation. When pressed, evolutionists often admit these gaps. For example, Lange has somewhere said: "How the external nerve movement gives rise to the internal contents of sense is wholly inexplicable." "How unity of physical image is gained out of the variety of elements is also inexplicable." Even Mr. Darwin acknowledges¹³ that he cannot trace the mental faculties from the lower animals to those which exist in men, though he believes, of course, that with ade-

¹³ *The Descent of Man*, I, p. 160.

quate knowledge they could be so traced. Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace recognizes three stages in the development of the organic world when some new cause or power must necessarily have come into action; viz; at the introduction of life, at the introduction of sensation or consciousness, and at the introduction of man. Nor do present-day students overlook the significance of these gaps. They admit them. They try to explain them away. They do this by endeavoring to show that, in view of the situation and from the nature of the case, the facts to bridge these gaps might be expected to be wanting.¹⁴ Now this, of course, may not be put down to the discredit of the theory in question. When evidence is impossible the lack of it is not prejudicial. On the other hand, a theory that is without evidence at its critical point cannot rank with one which accounts for all the facts with which it is related. Nor is this all. What can be more absurd than to deny, as many evolutionists do, metaphysical principles in favor of facts only to adopt as a theory of the universe and of man an hypothesis which, though it had all the other facts on its side, would not have those which were indispensable to it? Is not this like requiring us to believe a man because he has every element of character except veracity? It would seem, then, that there could be no room for hesitation as to choice between the two theories. The Supernaturalistic one, as we have seen, meets the necessities of the case by solving the problem presented by the amazing unity of the world; in explaining this, it gives due weight to the facts and conclusions of "the theory of evolution"; finally, it accounts for all the facts in the case by bridging over the gaps in the stream of development. It holds that at each of these God has intervened personally and directly, putting into the stream of development, to be developed in it and with it, what could not have appeared in it but for this intervention. Such

¹⁴ *Vide* Professor W. B. Scott: *The Theory of Evolution*, p. 82; also Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, p. 247.

a theory, it would seem, would not call for further argument. Its sufficiency is its vindication.

3. This is brought out more clearly when we consider, in comparison with it, the weakness of "the theory of evolution." Among many elements of weakness we may notice but three. Yet they are fatal:

a. The development of the moral sense. This is supposed to be derived from the experience of utility. What one finds to be useful is what ought to be done, and what ought to be done ought to be done because it is useful. That is, the useful and the obligatory are the same. But are they? A lie is often useful—is it, therefore, right? Kindness, at least in spirit, is always a duty—is it, therefore, invariably useful? Nor is the point evaded when it is urged that in the long run "honesty is the best policy" and that at last, in every case, kindness works out so as to be helpful to him that cherishes it and shows it when that can be consistently with justice. What is significant is that we appreciate the duty of honesty and of kindness long before and independently of any discernment of the advantages of either. We are sure that we ought not to lie precisely when, I might almost say because, it appears that it would be most helpful to lie. That is, the experience of utility may be the occasion; it cannot be the root of the moral sense. It may explain why it is that the moral sense appears when it does; it cannot explain why it is what it is. It may explain why this rather than that has come to be regarded as moral; it cannot explain the genesis and development of oughtness itself. The difference between it and oughtness, the moral sense, is not one of degree; it is one of kind: and unless all distinctions of thought are to be done away and thus, thought itself to be made impossible, such distinctions cannot be developed the one from the other. If they seem to have been so developed, it can be only because what was to have been developed has been presupposed.

Nor is the case different, if, for the good of the in-

dividual, that of the greatest number, or of society, be substituted. No more in this view than in the other can obligation be identified with utility. Were a baby to come down with some very contagious disease, undoubtedly the best thing for society would be to kill and bury him immediately and thus nip the pestilence in the bud. Few are they, however, who would not condemn and oppose such a course on the part of the authorities. But why? To answer this question, you must have a law superior to expediency and independent of it, a law, consequently, which cannot be explained as developed out of expediency, but which itself ultimately determines it.

The absurdity of this genesis of conscience from experience of utility, and of the latter from mere animal instinct, appears when we consider what it involves. "There must have been," as Dr. Dabney well says, "first in some earlier generation of men, a 'protoplasmic' reason, conscience, free agency, and responsibility, which were still three-quarters or half animal instinct, and the rest mental. But every man who ever scanned his own acts of soul knows that in all their stages, and in all their degrees of weakness and strength, they are entirely above and different from animal acts." They are not only better developed; they are of another sort. A feeble or even a perverted, conscience is no more like appetite in its intrinsic quality than is the conscience of a Washington or a Gladstone. To develop any kind of a conscience, therefore, from any kind of an appetite or instinct would be like getting out of a thing what never was in it, which is absurd.

Now the significance of all this appears in the fact that the moral sense or conscience is man's crowning distinction. Darwin himself says:¹⁵ "I fully subscribe to the judgment of those writers who maintain that of all the differences between man and the lower animals the moral sense or conscience is by far the most important. This sense, as Mackintosh remarks, 'has a rightful supremacy over every other

¹⁵ *The Descent of Man*, I, p. 70.

principle of human action'; it is summed up in that short but imperious word *ought*, so full of high significance. It is the most noble of all the attributes of man." What, then, shall we say of "the Theory of Evolution" in this relation? If it breaks down at the development of the moral sense, why try to vindicate it in other respects? To account for the moral sense by development alone, this must be its supreme aim and claim.

b. The evolution of variations. Let us hear the evolutionist's own account of it:¹⁶ "It is often said that evolution from the amoeba to man involves the addition of many new inheritance factors. This is probably true, but the addition of new factors does not mean their creation. New heredity factors are to be thought as we think of new chemical compounds which are formed of new combinations of the same old elements; or as we think of new elements such as helium and radium emanation, which are formed by dissociation of radium. As compared with chemical elements, the factors of heredity are probably very complex things and the new factors which appear in the course of evolution probably arise as new combinations of factors or of parts of factors previously present. In short, as modern science regards all types of organisms as having evolved by the transformation of previously existing organisms, so it must regard all types of hereditary factors as having existed from the beginning or as having evolved by transformations of preëxisting factors; as it regards all types of chemical compounds as having arisen by various combinations of chemical elements, so it must regard all 'new' elements as having existed from the beginning or as having evolved by the association or dissociation of still smaller particles, the negative and positive electrons. Nowhere in the entire process is there any evidence that factors or elements or electrons are created *de novo*. The whole process is one of evolution, that is, of new combinations of existing units, having new qualities

¹⁶ Vide Prof. Edwin Grant Conklin's *Heredity and Environment in the Development of Man*, p. 394.

which are the result of these new combinations." This description is so clear as to expose at once its inadequacy. This appears in the following, among other respects:

a. Creation *de novo* or *ex nihilo* is utterly and explicitly rejected. Yet if this be done, there is but one alternative. Factors or elements or electrons, i.e., the world, are themselves eternal and supernatural. These, indeed, are our gods or our God. This is what the "theory of evolution" comes down to. This is what "our Father which is in heaven" amounts to. Who can understand this and be satisfied with the exchange?

β. The analogy by which new combinations are explained is often not a true one. For example, Mr. Mill does not, as is claimed, help matters when he represents the association of ideas as "a process of a similar kind to chemical operation."¹⁷ The comparison is not justified by the facts. See what is implied in the production of a new body by chemical composition. There is one element, oxygen, for example, with its properties, and another element, hydrogen, with its properties, a mutual action in which there is potential energy expended, and a new product with its properties; and it is this mutual action, which we name chemical affinity and whose laws we try to determine, that causes the new element. In the association of ideas, however, it is quite different. We have two ideas, the idea, we will say, of honesty, and the idea of prosperity; and because these two ideas are found to follow one another we are told that there results the third and the dissimilar idea of the obligation to honesty. But this is a non sequitur. Ideas are not elements with properties. Above all, the mutual action of the combined elements, involving the operation of electricity, or of some one of the correlated forces of the universe, is not observable in the case of the association of ideas. That is, what makes the new product when chemical elements are properly combined appears to be absent even

¹⁷ *Logic*, B. VI, c. 4, 83.

when ideas are rightly associated. At the very point that is essential, therefore, the comparison breaks down. It follows, consequently, that the instrument of the theory is not what it is affirmed to be. Indeed it is quite ineffective. It can explain how it is that ideas arise together in thought; but it cannot give the new idea which it must originate, if the theory is to hold. It can tell us why it is easy and natural for us to think of certain things as obligatory, but it cannot tell us how the idea of oughtness came to be in our minds. It is an entirely new idea. It comes to us out of a clear sky. It is a creation in the sense of a revelation of and from and by God Himself.

γ. What starts and determines combination? There are four possible answers. It may all depend on chance. This supposition has only to be considered to be felt to be inconceivable. What, on the doctrine of probability, are the odds that "such a world as we actually experience" should have been brought about in this way? Venn¹⁸ says: "All the paper which the world has hitherto produced would be used up before we got far on in writing them down." Again, all is the result of law. Law, however, means only the observed sequence of given phenomena. It sets forth how things are; it has nothing to say as to why they are. In a word, law without intelligence and force behind it, and, indeed, ultimately, without God behind it, explains nothing. Once more, the persistence of force is appealed to. But neither can it help. Carried to its logical conclusion, the persistence of force reduces the universe to matter and motion. Who, however, can seriously consider himself and still think that the world comes down to this? In short, if we would think things through, we are driven to a fourth and last position; viz., the supernaturalistic one. Universal and unceasing combination brings us finally to a Supernatural Combiner. Evolution cannot be the ultimate and exclusive factor in the universe. The combination on which

¹⁸ *Logic of Chance*, p. 3.

it depends and by means of which it operates itself presupposes at the beginning, and afterward, a Supernatural Combiner. Indeed, if evolution is to be, as we grant that it is, a factor and a constant and very important one, in the development of the universe, it cannot be, as it claims, the only factor. Creation must begin and must continue the scheme of things, and even evolution itself. This is implied in science in the term "*creative synthesis*." It appears in philosophy in Bergson's doctrine of "*creative evolution*." It is fully and accurately presented in theology in the dogma of "*creatio mediata*" or "*secunda*." Thus it is that the combination by which evolution would eliminate the Supernatural only makes him the more necessary.

c. The universality of individuality. This is the final and the most serious obstacle that "the theory of evolution" has to surmount; and though it could overcome all the others, this one would prove fatal. By individuality we mean¹⁹ "that every living thing appears on careful examination to be the first and last of its identical kind. This is one of the most remarkable peculiarities of living things. . . . The individuals of biology are apparently never twice the same. . . . Every living being appears to be unique." Many other scientists would extend even such strict individuality to all things. Thus the distinguished botanist Professor York, once remarked in substance to the writer: "Not only is it true that no two leaves are alike; it is also true that no two atoms, no two electrons, are alike. Each one has an origin of its own, a character of its own, a history of its own, a destiny of its own." Indeed, the universality of individuality, as it is one of the surest, so it is probably the most tremendous of all the facts of existence. To account for anything, it demands a supernatural and, therefore, infinite being; for only such a being can create out of nothing, and individuality implies such special creation.²⁰ Indeed it is

¹⁹ *Vide* Conklin: *Heredity and Environment*, p. 213.

²⁰ *Vide* Orr, *God's Image in Man*, p. 232 and Martensen, *Dogmatics*, pp. 141, 142.

impossible without it. A few words should make this clear. An individual cannot be simply derived from or developed out of what was or is. If it were, it would partake of the quality of that from which it was derived or developed, and this would describe it. In so far, however, as we see that it does this and is this we feel that we have not touched its individuality. We discern the latter only when we discern what we see to be underived and undeveloped. In a word, real individuality and special creation stand or fall together. Where the former is the latter must have been; and, therefore, as everything is an individual, there is a true sense in which everything, however much a development, is also a creation. In a word, everything i.e. every individuality in the stream of evolution has, in the last analysis, been injected into it; and, consequently, while evolution is a factor in the universe, and a very important one, it cannot be, as it claims, the only one. By itself it cannot explain the universality of individuality. Only the living and creating God can effect and in so far forth explain it.

VI. Two objections are sure to be brought against the argument of this paper.

1. It presupposes God throughout. On this ground the scientist will turn his back on it. He may neither deny nor ignore the Supernatural, but he insists on restricting himself to the natural. In this, however, is he truly scientific? Is not the real distinction between science and philosophy, not that the former treats of facts as to the natural and the latter of those as to the Supernatural; but that science confines itself to facts whether natural or supernatural, whereas philosophy discusses the many questions which emerge in their explanation?

Nor may it be further objected that for purposes of study the natural may properly be set aside from the Supernatural just as one science may be set aside from the others. This might be, were it not that the facts of nature are so vitally related to the Supernatural that they cannot be fairly

considered out of relation to Him any more than one science can be presented in absolute isolation from the other sciences. Facts cannot be studied justly in independence of the great fact which both constitutes and supports them. Now that fact is God.

2. The argument rests ultimately on metaphysics. This is true. But can it be avoided? Someone has well said: "Do away with metaphysics and you do away with God." The "first and fundamental truths" which we call metaphysics are the laws of His being as well as of His world. Set them aside, therefore, or even decline to recognize them, and you deny him. Moreover, if we could cut loose from metaphysics, would there be any advantage in doing so? The great questions at issue are ultimately metaphysical ones. The validity of teleology, the reality of individuality, we at once recognize these as determining inquiries in "the theory of evolution"; and do they not bring us immediately to the heart of metaphysics? Nor is this merely our judgment. One of the strongest books from the standpoint of advanced evolution of the last ten years is "The First Principles of Evolution" by S. Herbert, M.D. (Vienna, M.R.-C.S. (Engl.) L.R.C.P. (Lond.), author of the "First Principles of Heredity." The closing words of his long and elaborate discussion are: "It is in the field of metaphysics rather than that of biology that the riddle of evolution will have to find its final solution."²¹

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

²¹ *The First Principles of Evolution*, p. 318.

IS GOD ALMIGHTY?

The central question in religious philosophy today is not that of the existence of God but of the kind of God who exists and with whom we have to do. It is possible to repeat the first clause of the creed, "I believe in God," while rejecting all of its other articles and having little sympathy with Christian theism. The tendencies of modern thinking, it must be admitted, are unfavorable to a full-orbed theism, and H. G. Wells is justified in his belief that "the new thought is taking a course that will lead it far away from the moorings of Omnipotence."¹ Evolution, for example, has taken the place of special creation or even of creation altogether, idealism has done away with the material world and with the necessity for its creator, pluralism has assigned to God only the place of *Primus inter pares* in the society of intelligent spirits, the metaphysical attributes have been discarded as beyond mortal ken and as having no value for religion, God is no longer worshipped as creator but as father, democracy would do away with a Heavenly King as well as with earthly kings, the Divine power has been limited in the interests of human freedom or even of self-communicating Divine love, while, to cap the climax, the poignant experiences of the greatest war in history have made acute in thousands of minds the old dilemma proposed by the problem of suffering: Is God lacking in love or limited in power?

To hail the dawning of a "creedless faith" in a Deity who is finite, temporal and changeable is to take advantage both of popular currents of thought and of the situation created by the war, but it must not be overlooked that the war and the disillusionment that has followed have produced another and quite different reaction in many thoughtful minds. If men have doubted the power of God they have come to doubt even more the power of man. We are not so sure as we were formerly that Western Civilization can permanently be taken for granted. The war has proved how

¹*God the Invisible King*, p. 158.

effectively the edged tools of invention can be used for mutual destruction, and their effectiveness will no doubt be largely increased in the event of the new Armageddon now freely predicted by responsible statesmen. Preventives of war such as commerce, finance, ease of communication, education and diplomacy have proved their inadequacy, and progress is no longer seen as something inevitable and automatic in the course of human evolution. The conviction is deepening that society cannot save itself by its own efforts, and the utterances of statesmen, economists, educators and business men show their belief that at any rate a civilization founded on selfishness is doomed to destruction. If society cannot save itself it can only be saved from outside itself, whether deliverance is to come without observation through new accessions of Divine grace and power, or, according to the hope quickened now as at the dawn of the Christian era in many hearts, by the advent of a supernatural Deliverer. Human impotence naturally makes its appeal to Omnipotence: our help is in the name of the Lord who made heaven and earth. The question of our title is not lacking in timeliness and we may find it profitable to seek for its answer in the threefold field of Scripture, of religious experience and of philosophical discussion.

I. THE BIBLICAL DATA.

To examine the Biblical writings with the topic of the Divine omnipotence in mind is to be convinced anew of the unity of Scripture. It may be said without exaggeration that belief in the almighty power of God is assumed in every book, if not in every chapter and every verse. Even where moral limitations are suggested, as when it is said that God "interposed with an oath, that by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement" (Heb. vi. 17, 18), or, "in hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before times eternal" (Tit. i. 2), or, "he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself" (2 Tim. ii. 13), it is significant that these

passages really contain the strongest kind of affirmation that God's promises and purposes of grace toward his people will certainly be fulfilled. It is this aspect of omnipotence in which the Scriptural writers are naturally most interested.

The Bible writers do not discuss omnipotence in the abstract, but far more impressively they describe the exercise of almighty power in the concrete spheres of creation, of providence, of history and of redemption. Naturally they do not, as in a treatise on systematic theology, deal with the attributes of God separately, but their thought passes easily from the wisdom of God in devising his plans to his power in carrying them out and to his benevolence in providing for the good of his people. Thus power and wisdom are combined in such passages as Is. xl. 28 and Amos iv. 13, and the plenitude of the Divine attributes, majesty and might and goodness and righteousness and mercy, is celebrated in Ps. cxlv.

The names of God in the Old Testament, while for the most part uncertain in their etymology, give prominence in their usage to the idea of transcendent power. By the name "I AM" (Ex. iii. 14), says W. T. Davidson, God makes himself known as "the one, true God, self-existent and self-sufficient, the cause and ground of all being."² Bavinck finds the idea of power prominent in the Divine names and summarizes his discussion by saying: "Jehovah Sabaoth is throughout the Scripture the solemn kingly name of God, full of majesty and glory. Elohim points out God as Creator and Sustainer of all things; El Shaddai makes him known as the Mighty One who puts nature at the service of grace; Jehovah describes him as one who is forever faithful in his grace; Jehovah of Hosts portrays him as surrounded by his serried hosts, ruling over the whole world as the Almighty, and in his temple receiving honor and homage from all his creatures"³ It is to be noted that while the Greek translators are not uniform in their renderings of the Divine

²*Hastings' Encycl. Rel. and Ethics*, vol. vii, p. 254, col. 1.

³*Gereform. Dogmatiek*², Pt. ii, p. 135.

names yet they clearly see in them the idea of almighty power. Thus the name *El Shaddai*, of whose 41 occurrences 31 are found in Job, is 16 times in Job translated παντοκράτωρ (the Almighty). Jehovah of Hosts (*Sabaoth*), found 193 times in the Old Testament⁴ is sometimes rendered Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, or "Lord of the powers" (7 times in the Pss. and in 2 Sam. vi. 2 and 18; 1 Ki. xviii. 15; 2 Ki. iii. 14); more often by Κύριος σαβωθ (the favorite rendering in Isaiah and found also in 1 Sam. i. 3 and 11; xv. 2); and still more frequently by Κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ, "Lord Almighty" (almost uniformly in the 91 times of the Minor Prophets, very often in the 34 times in Jeremiah, and in 2 Sam. v. 10; vii. 8, 26, 27; 1 Ki. xix. 10; 2 Chron. xi. 9; xvii. 7 and 24).

In the New Testament the term Κύριος (Lord), used of God 120 times and of Christ 368 times,⁵ emphasizes in its usage and its derivation the idea of supreme power. The designation παντοκράτωρ (Almighty) is used alone or in combination with other titles 10 times (2 Cor. vi. 8; Rev. i. 8; iv. 8; xi. 17; xv. 3; xvi. 7 and 14; xix. 6 and 15; xxi. 22).

The sovereign and unlimited power of God expressed or implied in the Divine names is directly asserted or unmistakably assumed in a number of passages both in the Old and the New Testaments. Some of the most striking of these are in the form of rhetorical questions, as in Gen. xviii. 14, "Is anything too hard for Jehovah?" This passage in its Greek form is apparently in mind when it is said in the annunciation to Mary, "No word from God shall be void of power" (Luke i. 37). Similar rhetorical questions are asked in Num. xi. 23, "Is Jehovah's hand waxed short?" Is. i. 2, "Is my hand shortened at all, that it cannot redeem? or have I no power to deliver?" in Jer. xxxii. 26, "Is there anything too hard for me?" Statements to similar effect are made in Is. lix. 1, "Behold, Jehovah's hand is not shortened that it cannot save," and in Jer. xxxii. 17, "Ah Lord Jehovah! Be-

⁴According to Professor R. D. Wilson in this REVIEW, July, 1920, p. 463.

⁵So again Professor R. D. Wilson in this REVIEW, July, 1921, p. 393.

hold, thou hast made the heavens and the earth by thy great power and by thine outstretched arm; there is nothing too hard for thee." Job, in the time of his enlightenment, declared, "I know that thou canst do all things, and that no purpose of thine can be restrained" (xlii. 2); and in Moses' song it is said, "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound and I heal; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand" (Deut. xxxii. 39). For the most solemn and repeated assertions of sole and transcendent existence and of absolute, unlimited power we turn to the later chapters of Isaiah, where we read: "I, Jehovah, the first and with the last, I am he" (xli. 3); "Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am Jehovah; and besides me there is no Saviour" (xliii. 10, 11); "Thus saith Jehovah that created the heavens, the God that formed the earth and made it, that established it and created it not a waste, that formed it to be inhabited: I am Jehovah; and there is none else" (xlv. 18, and cf. verses 5, 6, 12, 14, 21 and 22). The idea of God that is taught in these chapters of Isaiah has been well characterized by George Adam Smith as an absolute monotheism which finds no rival among the faiths of the world: "God has been exalted before us, in character so perfect, in dominion so universal, that neither the conscience nor the imagination of man can add to the general scope of the vision. . . . It is already as lofty an idea of the unity and sovereignty of God as the thoughts of man can follow."⁶

It might be thought that the New Testament writers with the Old Testament before them would ignore by tacitly assuming the doctrine of Divine omnipotence, but we find that their testimony is equally strong and even more explicit. Those who saw in the ministry of Jesus a proof of supernatural forces working among men were "astonished at the majesty of God" (Luke ix. 43) and were "amazed and

⁶Expositors' Bible, "*Isaiah*," vol. ii. p. 236. Certainly W. James could not have these passages in mind when he says in his *Pluralistic Universe* (p. 111) that the God of David and Isaiah, was "essentially finite."

glorified God" (Mk. ii. 12). Such control over the forces of nature and of human life suggested an unlimited reservoir of power at Jesus' command. The statements of Jesus as to the power of faith and of the prayer of faith look in the same direction. If the scene of the Transfiguration was Mount Hermon as is generally supposed, an added point is given to the saying, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto THIS mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you" (Matt. xvii. 20).⁷ The familiar and repeated promises made to believing prayer in all four Gospels open to the believer a realm of unlimited possibility, and certainly such promises could not fairly and truly have been made if there were only limited resources at the disposal of the Hearer and Answerer of prayer. "All things are possible to him that believeth" (Mk. ix. 23) because faith has access to Divine resources and "all things are possible with God" (Mk. x. 27; Matt. xix. 26). The words last quoted are confirmed by the solemn prayer in Gethsemane, "Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee: remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt" (Mk. xiv. 36). The brief words of this prayer, coming from the heart of Jesus and from the heart of the situation in the hour of his deepest human need, teach us that the two conceptions of Father and Sovereign may be and must be combined in our thought of God. They show us that the omnipotence of God is the major premise expressed or implied in all true prayer, and that the wise and holy will of God prescribes the limits within which his power is to be exercised.

In the Acts and Epistles the Divine power is evidenced in the fearlessness and enthusiasm of the apostolic witnesses as they carry the gospel in triumph from Jerusalem to Rome. It is seen in signs and wonders accompanying

⁷An illiterate but pious man was heard to comment thus upon this passage: "You people read the Bible backward; you read it as if it said, If ye have faith as a mountain, ye can move a grain of mustard seed."

their preaching and in notable conversions such as that of Paul the persecutor and of the multitude at Pentecost. It is seen in the wonderful energy of a Paul who gives the secret of abundant labors in the words, "striving according to his working which worketh in me mightily" (Col. i. 29). It is seen in "the exceeding greatness of his power" (Eph. i. 19) working in the hearts of believers. The standpoint of the Apostle is exactly that of the Old Testament prophets in his belittling of human agency in the work of redemption and his exalting of the sovereign initiative and gracious operation of God. Thus Jeremiah's description of the new covenant, which results not from Israel's obedience but from their moral failure, is wholly in terms of the Divine initiative: "I will put my law into their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (Jer. xxxi. 33). In spite of (or because of) Isaiah's strenuous insistence upon moral reformation, it is clear that he regards the will and power of God as the ultimately determining factor in Israel's redemption: "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins" (Is. xliii. 25). Ezekiel, who gives the most realistic description of Israel's utter moral and spiritual degradation, gives the strongest expression to the sovereign grace and power of God: "I do not this for your sake, O house of Israel, but for my holy name . . . And I will sanctify my great name . . . and the nations shall know that I am Jehovah . . ." And I will sprinkle clean water upon you . . . A new heart will I give you . . . Not for your sake do I this" (Ezek. xxxvi. 22-32). This is essentially Paul's doctrine of a salvation which excludes boasting. No recorded prayer makes larger draughts upon Divine resources than does Paul's prayer in Ephesians (iii. 14-19), but as if overwhelmed by the untold riches of the treasure house of grace and power he exclaims, "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that

worketh in us, unto him be the glory." "I have asked for a cupful" says J. H. Jowett, "and the ocean remains! I have asked for a sunbeam and the sun abides." Adolphe Monod comments on the passage: "Nothing can restrain or bound the power of God toward us; nothing in him, nothing even in us; no limits set to his power, for it knows no limits; not even the weakness of our prayers, and the imperfection of our knowledge, for he is able to transcend all our demands and all our conceptions."⁸ In the prophetic parts of the New Testament it is predicted that the enemies of the Messiah will be the footstool of his feet (Mk. xii.36), and that he will put all enemies under his feet including death (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26), that he can subdue all things to himself, and that to him every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that he is Lord (Phil. iii. 21; ii. 10, 11), that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of Christ (Rev. xi. 15), that God will take his great power and reign, and that the shout of triumph will finally be raised, "Hallelujah: for the Lord our God, the Almighty, reigneth" (xi. 17; xix. 6).

Instead of saying that God is omnipotent the Bible writers are more apt to say that he created the heaven and the earth, or that he delivered his people from Egypt, or that he raised up Jesus from the dead. God's power is shown in the three spheres of nature, history and the Incarnation, and most signally shown in the creation of the world and the absolute control of natural forces, in bringing Israel out of Egypt with a mighty hand and a stretched-out arm, and in raising the Lord Jesus from the dead.

The stupendous miracle of creation is the primary and fundamental exercise of infinite power, and the primary exercise of faith is to believe that the worlds were formed by the word of God (Heb. xi. 3). To fix the relation of God to the world as its creator is to lay the foundation of all further thought of God and to place man in right rela-

⁸Quoted in Moule: *Ephesian Studies*, pp. 133, 134.

tions with God. The world is God's world, the sea is his and he made it and his hands formed the dry land, science is the reading of his thoughts after him, history is his story, the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, nations are the instruments of his providence and men are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand. When Neesima, founder of the "Dooshisha" in Japan, found as a lad a copy of the opening words of the Bible in Chinese, he read the first verse and as he says: "I put down the book and looked around me, saying, Who made me? my parents? No, my God." Then he prayed: "Oh, if you have eyes, look upon me; if you have ears, listen for me."⁹ If God is creator men ought to worship him as the living God (Acts. xiv. 15; xvii. 25; Rom. i. 29; Dan. v. 23), and adore his power and majesty as shown in his creative works. His power is magnified in contrast with the powerlessness of other gods (Ps. xcvi. 5; Jer. x. 11, 12) with the littleness and weakness of men (Ps. viii. 3, 4), with the insignificance of nations who are as a drop in the bucket and less than nothing and vanity (Is. xl. 15, 17), and with the contingency and transitoriness of nature (Ps. cii. 25-27).

The heavens declare the glory of God, and the contemplation of his created works inspires the lofty strains of psalmist, poet and prophet. He makes light his garment; he lays the beams of his chambers in the waters; he makes the clouds his chariot; he measures the waters in the hollow of his hand; he made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning and the thunder. These are but parts of his ways, but the thunder of his power who can understand? (Ps. civ. 2, 3; Is. xl. 12; Job xxviii. 26; xxvi. 14). God's glory is in the heavens, but his glory is above the heavens (Ps. viii. 1), and he is exalted above all the earth (Ps. lvii. 5, 11). The heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him (2 Chron. vi. 18). He has absolute control over every part and every power of nature; heaven is his throne and the earth

⁹ Davis: *Life of J. H. Neesima*, pp. 20, 21.

his footstool because his hand made all these things (Is. lxvi. 1, 2; Acts vii. 42, 50).

Since God is the creator of all things all power comes from God (Ps. lxii. 11), no power can resist him, and his power extends over all.¹⁰ It may be, as Tertullian says, that God's glory is greater if he labored, but the energy exercised in creation is the energy of omnipotence: "By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made; for he spake, and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast" (Ps. xxxiii. 6, 9). Everything that can be named is brought within the sweep of his creative activity. He created "the heavens and the earth" (Gen. i. 1), the usual formula, though not used with scientific exactness, for the visible universe or for the material world with all its contents and inhabitants (Ps. cxv. 15; cxxi. 2; Matt. xi. 25; Mk. xiii. 31; Acts xvii. 24).¹¹ He made all the nations of the earth (Acts xvii. 26); he is the creator of Israel (Is. xliii. 1); he is the creator of the idol makers and of those who destroy (Is. liv. 16); he creates light and darkness and even evil (Is. xlv. 7); he will create new heavens and new earth (Is. lxv. 17). As creator of all things he has supreme control over all natural forces and over men and nations. With equal ease he can make Assyria the rod of his anger to chasten Israel (Is. x. 5) and he can punish Israel's enemies. His purpose cannot be frustrated; his hand is stretched over the nations; who can turn it back?

¹⁰Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, p. 431, makes these three points. He says that "as in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things; so in respect of the intension, he hath all power over everything" (p.66).

¹¹The addition of "the sea and all that in them is" (Ex. xx. 11, etc.) makes no essential difference as will be seen from Ex. xxxi. 17 which is without the addition. Gen. i. 1 is echoed in Jno. i. 3, "All things were made through him;" Eph. iii. 9, "God who created all things;" Rev. iv. 11, "Thou didst create all things." The expressions, "maker of heaven and earth" in the Apostles' creed and "maker of all things visible and invisible" in the Nicene creed are practically interchangeable. The fullest expression is in Neh. ix. 6, "Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein, the seas and all that is in them, and thou preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth thee."

(Is. xiv. 27). No weapon formed against his people shall prosper (Is. liv. 17); his counsel shall stand: none can deliver out of his hand; he will work and who can hinder? (Is. xlvi. 10; xliii. 13). He does his will in the armies of heaven and amongst the inhabitants of the earth (Dan. iv. 35). No power in space or time or in the spiritual world or in the exigencies of human existence can separate from his love (Rom. viii. 38, 39).

The belief in the almighty power of God in creation is with the saints of the Bible no merely formal article in their creed but enters vitally into their religious experience. With kings and prophets and reformers and apostles it gives confidence to their faith and is made the basis of their appeal in prayer (2 Ki. xix. 15; Is. xxxvi. 16; Neh. i. 5, 10; ix. 6, 22; Acts. iv. 24). The assurance that because the God of Israel is the Creator he can and certainly will fulfill his gracious promises to Israel is strong in the lofty and impetuous eloquence of the later chapters of Isaiah. Because he is the Creator of the ends of the earth, he will give power to the faint (Is. xl. 28); it is he who has created the heavens and given breath to man that has called Israel in righteousness (xlii. 5, 6); it is the Lord who made all things that says of Jerusalem, She shall be inhabited (xliv. 24, 26); it is he who made the earth and stretched out the heavens that shall build the city and let the exiles go free (xlv. 12, 13); it is the maker of Israel and of the heavens who shall destroy the fury of the oppressor (li. 12); it is the maker and husband of Israel who is her Redeemer, the God of the whole earth (liv. 5).

As the omnipotence of God is the solution of Israel's problem in Isaiah, so it is the solution of the personal problem in the book of Job. The patriarch's questionings as he struggles with his own sufferings and with the problem of suffering are not answered, as modern logic might suggest, by the thought that God's power is limited, but by sustained and overwhelming revelation of the power of God as shown

in his wondrous works (xxxviii-xli). Job gains a new vision of God, not only of his power but of his wisdom and holiness, and exclaims, "I know that thou canst do all things, and that no purpose of thine can be restrained, I uttered that which I understood not, things too wonderful for me which I knew not. I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes" (xlii. 2, 6).

It is well known that the interpretation of the first three verses of Genesis has recently been the subject of active debate. Following the suggestion first made by Raschi, a Jewish exegete of the eleventh century, some scholarly expositors take the first word *B'reshith* in the construct state, "In the beginning of God's creating," etc., so that verse 1 is no longer an independent sentence but a sort of protasis to verse 3, verse 2 being a parenthesis. The sense would then be: "When God began to create the heavens and the earth (now the earth was without form, etc. . . .) God said, Let there be light." The tendency of those who adopt this construction is to revive the Gnostic-dualistic theory of an original formless matter, co-eval with the Deity and merely shaped or molded by him. The subject is of interest to us because of its bearings upon the question of omnipotence.

(1) Verse 1 is usually taken as an independent sentence, describing the calling into being (from non-being) of the universe by the Divine word and will; then verse 2 describes the condition of the created world before light and order were evoked. The words so understood form a simple and majestic introduction to the narrative of the six creative days, and contain the maximum of truth about the relation of God to the world in the minimum of words, excluding the errors of materialism, polytheism, pantheism and dualism. The term *bārā* may not be sufficient in itself to bear the whole weight of the *ex nihilo* doctrine of creation, but it is admitted that if the writer wished to convey the idea of absolute origination or calling from non-existence into existence there is no more appropriate word, or in fact no

other appropriate word, in Hebrew to express the thought.¹² What is decisive is the general conception of God in this chapter, utterly foreign to that of a Demiurge forming the world out of more or less intractable material: there is no obstacle to fulfillment of his will—He said, Let there be light, and there was light; and no failure or defect in its complete accomplishment—He saw that all things were good.¹³ Ryle maintains that Genesis never deviates from the pure monotheism of the Israelitic prophets, and says that while Hebrews xi. 3 (creation out of nothing) is not asserted in verse 1, yet “it is implied in the general representation of God’s omnipotence, and his sole personal action.”¹⁴ Comparing the Babylonian and Hebrew cosmogonies, K. Fullerton says: “In the one account creation is described in the most mythological terms. It is a struggle between the gods of light and order against the monstrous powers of darkness and anarchy. In Genesis God speaks and it is done. There is no struggle, no effort here, only the calm of absolute

¹²Skinner notes the following points in the use of the word: “(a) The most important fact is that it is used exclusively of *divine* activity—a restriction to which perhaps no parallel can be found in other languages. (b) The idea of *novelty* or *extraordinariness* of result is frequently implied, and it is noteworthy that this is the case in the only two passages of certainly early date where the word occurs. (c) It is probable that it contains the idea of *effortless* production (such as befits the Almighty) by word or volition (Ps. xxxiii. 9). (d) It is obvious (from this chapter and many other other passages) that the sense stops short of *creatio ex nihilo*,—an idea first explicitly occurring in 2 Mac. vii. 28. At the same time the facts just stated, and the further circumstance that the word is always used with the acc. of product and never of material, constitute a long advance towards the full theological doctrine, and make the word ‘create’ a suitable vehicle for it” (*Genesis*: Internat. Crit. Com., p. 15).

¹³Jowett attempts to assimilate the Platonic representation in the *Timaeus* to the doctrine of creation out of nothing, saying that “the original conception of matter having no qualities is really a negation, and might as well be represented by nothing.” He admits however that the Platonic conception has less of freedom or spontaneity than the Jewish description, and that the Creator in Plato “is still subject to a remnant of necessity which he cannot wholly overcome” (*Dialogues*, ii. p. 492).

¹⁴*Genesis*, Cambridge Bible, p. 3, and see p. xlvii.

power, the effortlessness of omnipotence." Of Genesis i. he says, "This chapter stands out as the magna charta of ethical monotheism, a bulwark against the polytheism and the pantheism of the ancient world, and all the ethical and spiritual confusion which they inevitably produced."¹⁵

(2) Genesis i. 1 may be again regarded as an independent sentence, but now as a sort of heading or summary of the contents of the chapter, so that the first statement in chronological order is verse 2. "The heavens and the earth," it is insisted, must refer to the ordered universe, as in ii. 1. It is possible to import dualism into this interpretation, as is done by H. G. Mitchell who says: "*God created*. Not from nothing, but, as appears from v. 2, from matter already in existence."¹⁶ The best representative of this second interpretation, however, is Dillmann who says that the question of the origin of the chaos is not raised, but that if raised there is no doubt that the author "on the ground of his conception of God must have decided that the world considered as to its material has the ground of its possibility and of its existence in the Divine will. . . . That God spoke and it was done—therein lies not only the ease and effortlessness of his creation, his omnipotence (*Allmacht*), but also the fact that he created of his own consciousness and will."¹⁷

(3) The third interpretation, taking the word "beginning" (*Reshith*) in the construct state with what follows, makes both verses 1 and 2 introductory to verse 3. The meaning becomes: When God began to create—(now the earth was without form—and the spirit of God was brooding—), then God said, Let there be light. Here again, it may be noted that nothing is said about the origin of the primitive formless earth or chaos, and no dualism of an eternally co-existing matter is necessarily implied. Thus Raschi, who first advocated this construction on the ground that "beginning" in

¹⁵"The Problem of the Old Testament," *Biblical World*, Nov., 1912, pp. 333, 335.

¹⁶*Genesis* in the "Bible for Home and School" series, p. 29.

¹⁷*Genesis*⁴, 1882, pp. 18, 19.

Scripture is not used absolutely but always means the beginning of something, says nothing to intimate that a Greek dualism is implied in it,¹⁸ and Bennett who follows his lead says that the origin of the chaos is left open to question.¹⁹ Gunkel, however, insists that the notion of the creation of a chaos is contradictory and whimsical; chaos is the world before the creation. He believes that neither the Old Testament as a whole nor P. reaches the conception of creation *ex nihilo* (2 Mac. vii. 28; Heb. xi. 3); the meaning rather is that God found a chaos before the creation and made the world out of formless matter (Sap. Sol. xi. 18). So "creation" means a specially great miracle, but not a wholly unique act involving omnipotence.²⁰

It cannot be said that the arguments either for the construct state of *Reshith* or for the inferences drawn from it by some modern exegetes are very convincing. Holzinger, (*in loc.*) who accepts the Raschi interpretation on the analogy of Gen. ii. 2b-7, admits that *Reshith* is used absolutely in Is. xlvi. 10, "declaring the end from the beginning." The "beginning" in any language, as with ἀρχή in Greek, is of course usually the beginning of something, but this does not prevent it from being used in an absolute sense when the subject requires. In the New Testament we read of "the beginning of the gospel" (Mk. i. 1), "the beginning of signs" (Jno. ii. 11), "the beginning of confidence" (Heb. iii. 14), but this does not prevent the writers from using the word absolutely in Jno. i. 1; 1 Jno. i. 1; Matt. xix. 4 and 8, where the meaning is practically the same as Matt. xxiv. 21 "the beginning of the cosmos," or Mk. x. 6 "the beginning of creation." "The essentially *relative* idea of *Reshith*," insisted on by Skinner²¹ is a slender foundation upon which to build the theory of chaos before the creation, and is more than offset by the implications of the word *bārā*.

¹⁸*Pentateuch*, ed. Dessauer, 1863, p. 2.

¹⁹*Genesis*, New Century Bible series, *in loc.*

²⁰*Genesis*, pp. 90, 91; and cf. *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 7.

²¹P. 13 n.

To the assertion that a created chaos is a contradiction, the remark of Delitzsch is in point: "If it does not contradict the idea of an Almighty God that the development of the cosmos was effected in a series of gradually advancing stages, neither will the fact of his having made chaotic primitive matter, as yet formless and confused, the foundation of this development."²² But what of the position taken by Gunkel, Skinner and others that "the heavens and the earth" of verse 1 must mean the ordered cosmos and cannot refer to the creation of the watery waste of verse 2, the proper designation for which is "the earth"? We must remember that the events of verses 1 and 2 cannot on any theory be described except in terms of our present knowledge, which necessarily has to do with the ordered world. We cannot expect scientific precision when terms are used in a pictorial sense and in the meagre vocabulary of Gen. i. Thus the "earth" is used not only in connection with the heavens in verse 1, and to describe the chaotic waste of waters in verse 2, but of the fully formed dry land in distinction from the waters in verse 10. There is no reason why "the heavens and the earth," the usual term throughout Scripture, as we have seen, for the visible universe, could not be used of the world in the primitive as well as in the later stages of its development.

The practically uniform interpretation of Genesis i. by other Scriptural writers, by the church fathers, by all the versions and by the succession of Jewish and Christian exegetes should carry some weight with the exegete of today. Under any theory of authorship the connection is certainly close between the creation narrative and Isaiah xl. ff. which is filled with the thought of God as Creator and reiterates the refrain, "I am the first; I am God, and there is none else." The uncompromising monotheism of Isaiah leaves no place for an uncreated chaos existing side by side with God. Skinner observes that in the Genesis cosmogony "the monotheistic principle of the Old Testament has obtained classical ex-

²²*Genesis*, E. T., vol. i. p. 80.

pression. The great idea of God, first proclaimed in all its breadth and fulness by the second Isaiah during the exile, is here embodied in a detailed account of the genesis of the universe, . . . The central doctrine is that the world is *created*—that it originates in the will of God, a personal Being transcending the universe and existing independently of it.”²³ On the modern theory of authorship it is peculiarly difficult to suppose, with Strachan,²⁴ that P., an intensely Jewish and legalistic writer, had immediately declined from the pure monotheism of II. Isaiah and had introduced into it the idea of a (Greek) dualism, so foreign to the Isaian conception, to his own narrative even in the same chapter and to every other Scriptural writer whether earlier or later. If another cosmology, as Strachan suggests, is taught in Gen. i., it is certain that P. did not succeed in imposing it on his countrymen. “Most Jewish philosophers,” we read in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, “find in *Breshith* (Gen. i. 1) creation *ex nihilo*,”²⁵ and modern Jewish exegetes, even when they see in Gen. i. a derivation from Babylonian and other cosmogonies, say that the Genesis account was meant “to impress and to express the twin-doctrines of God’s creative omnipotence and of man’s dignity as being destined on earth to be a creator himself.”²⁶

In the Apocryphal writings the statement in 2 Mac. vii. 28, “Look upon the heaven and the earth—God made them

²³*Genesis*, pp. 6, 7. Skinner’s position is puzzling, for after saying the above he adds: “It is indeed doubtful if the representation goes so far as a *creatio ex nihilo*, or whether a pre-existent chaotic material is postulated; it is certain at least that the *kosmos*, the ordered world . . . is wholly the product of divine intelligence and volition.” He then speaks of God’s “absolute sovereignty over the material He employs,” “the effortless expression of his thought and purpose,” and says that each part, pronounced good, “perfectly reflected the divine thought which called it into existence.” A pre-existing material so absolutely responsive to the effortless volition of God could scarcely have existed independently of God.

²⁴*Hastings’ Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics*, vol. iv., p. 229, col. i.

²⁵Art. “Creation,” vol. iv., p. 336.

²⁶Art. “Cosmogony,” vol. iv., p. 281.

of things that were not (οὐκ ἔξ ὄντων) is offset by Wisdom of Solomon xi. 17, "Thy Almighty (παντοδύναμος) hand that made the world of formless matter (ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης)." In the latter passage, however, while the form of expression seems influenced by Greek thought, the whole purpose is to emphasize rather than to belittle the power of God. In the context it is said, "Who hast made all things by thy word" (ix. 1); "Wisdom was with thee and was present when thou madest the world" (ix. 9); God could send upon his enemies "newly-created" (νεοκτίστους) beasts breathing out fire (xi. 18); "For thou canst show thy great strength at all times . . . ; and who can withstand the power of thine arm? For the whole world before thee is as a little grain of the balance. . . . For thou canst do all things . . . And how could anything have endured, if it had not been thy will? or been preserved, if not called by thee?" (xi. 21, 22, 23, 25). There is no hint here of any intractable material, and it is not surprising that many have seen in this "formless matter" an allusion to a *creatio secunda*, not excluding a *creatio prima*.

The New Testament writers, basing themselves on the Genesis narrative, are explicit in negating the theory of a pre-existent matter. The Logos or Son was in the beginning and all things were made by him (Jno. i. 1, 2); he was before all things (Col. i. 17); and before the foundation of the world (Jno. xvii. 24); God calls the things that are not as though they were (Rom. iv. 17); and we understand by faith that the worlds, or ages, were framed by the word of God so that what is seen has not been made out of things which appear (Heb. xi. 3).

The church fathers under Platonic influence might easily have seen in Gen. i. 1, 2 the dualism of a pre-existing matter if this view had any plausible exegetical support, but we find them with practical unanimity adopting the alternative of creation out of nothing as in harmony with the Biblical narrative. They saw with a sure instinct that to set up pre-existing matter as an independent sphere of being, co-

eternal with God and supplying him with indispensable means for his work or prescribing the lines it must follow, —to conceive of God, as we might say, with an "environment" in no way dependent upon his will—would be to detract from his power and glory if not to set up another deity. In Rouët de Journal's *Enchiridion Patristicum* (new ed., 1913) we find 40 references under the heading "*Creatio ex nihilo*," and the number might be considerably increased. That the world was called into being out of nothing by the Divine word was the opinion of Hermas (Mand. i. 1; Sim. 8), Theophilus (*ad. Autol.* ii. 4, 10 and 13), Aristides (*Apol.* 4), Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* i. 22.1; ii. 10.4), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v. 14), Tertullian (*contra Hermog.* 33, and often), Hippolytus (in Gen. i. and *Ref. Haer.* x. 32), Origen, who holds that God was always creative but yet says that God did not find matter already in existence, but made the things that are out of nothing (*de Princ.* i. 4; ii. 164; *Com. on John* 18, 3), Lactantius (*Div. Inst.*, ii. 9), Augustine (*Conf.* xi. 5; xii. 7, etc.).²⁷ Justin alone, arguing that Plato derived his doctrine from Moses, says that the world was made of formless matter (ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης, *Apol.* i. 10), but as he says elsewhere that God made all things, that the world was made or begotten (γεννητός, *Dial c. Thyph.* 5), and in his *Address to the Greeks*, assuming its genuineness, says in opposition to Plato that God made what he made by his own power (22), he was certainly no unqualified adherent of the Greek dualism.

We have gone at some length into the subject of the interpretation of Genesis i. because of the fundamental importance of the passage and the radical difference which has been developed in its recent discussion. Into an interpretation, that of Raschi and his followers, which is confessedly rhetorically weak and throws into undue prominence the

²⁷The usual expression in Greek is ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων but ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος (Hermas), ἐκ μὴ ὄντος (2 Clem. ad Cor. i. 8), and ἐκ μὴ ὄντων (Hippolytus in Gen. i) are found without essential difference of meaning.

creation of light in verse 3 (while the creation of the heavens and the earth, i. 1 and ii. 1, is plainly the main topic of the writer), has been imported the dualistic idea of a pre-existent matter, entirely foreign to Hebrew thought and impairing the purity of its monotheism and without a trace of influence in any other verse of the Bible or in any version. The burden of proof plainly rests on the advocates of the new exegesis, and with a good exegetical conscience we may regard the opening verses of Genesis, telling with matchless simplicity and beauty of the stupendous miracle of calling the universe into being by almighty power, as the appropriate doorway to the temple of Scripture, rather than as an obtrusive defect in the architecture which mars and weakens the impression of the whole.

2. Briefly we notice the two other spheres in which for the Scripture writers the power of God has been signally exhibited. The great historic miracle of the Old Testament is the deliverance of Israel from Egypt with a mighty hand and a stretched out arm. The indelible impression which this event or series of events made on the national consciousness is reflected by psalmists and prophets and in the historical books. "Ask now of the days that are past . . . since the day that God created man upon the earth . . . , Did ever a people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live? Or hath God essayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by an out-stretched arm, and by great terrors, according to all that Jehovah God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? Know therefore this day, . . . that Jehovah he is God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath; there is none else" (Deut. iv. 32-34, 39). Appropriately the works of nature responded to this unique exhibition of Divine power: "When Israel went forth out of Egypt, the sea saw it and fled; the Jordan was driven back, The mountains skipped like rams, the little hills like lambs.

Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the Lord" (Ps. civ. 1, 3, 4, 7). The power of God shown in the events of the exodus furnishes constantly the theme of praise and the basis of appeal in prayer and is the ground of confidence in God's covenant relation to his people: His right hand is glorious in power; he is fearful in praises, doing wonders (Ex. xv. 6 and 11); "I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt: open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it" (Ps. lxxxi. 10); "What one nation in the earth is like thy people . . . whom God went to redeem for himself . . . to do great and terrible things" (2 Sam. vii. 23). As Ps. civ. is the psalm of creation so Pss. cv. and cvi. are psalms of redemption from Egypt. "Who can utter the mighty acts of Jehovah, or show forth all his praise? (Ps. cvi. 2). In Ps. cxxxvi. the creation of the world and deliverance from Egypt furnish the double sphere in which God's power and goodness are displayed; and there is the double appeal to the God of creation and redemption in prayers such as that of Nehemiah, ix. 6 and 9. God deals with nations today as much as he did in the time of Moses and Pharaoh, but never in the history of a nation has his supreme power been so dramatically displayed as in the deliverance of Israel and their establishment in national existence.

3. As the Jews believed in a God who brought Israel out of Egypt, so Christians believe in a God who raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead. Resurrection is, in fact, a sort of correlative to creation; for both are wholly supernatural works and call for the highest conceivable exercise of transcendent power. As creation means lordship over nature and mankind, so resurrection means headship over the church. It points out Jesus as the Son of God with power, possessed of the power of an endless life; it means that he is exalted to lordship over dead and living; that to him has been given for the church the gift of the Holy Spirit; that he has broken the power of death and reigns at God's right hand, now in intercession for his saints and in ultimate triumph over

all his enemies; that he is the head of principalities and powers; that he is the Prince and author of life; that to believe in him is to believe in a God who can raise the dead; that he has broken the power of death for himself and his people; that he can raise up those who are dead in trespasses and sins; that he can break the power of sin and make it possible to walk in newness of life; that to know him and the power of his resurrection opens new possibilities in experience and in service; that he will finally complete our redemption by the change of bodily weakness and humiliation into power and glory. It means that Jesus is the strong Son of God, immortal love; that all authority is given to him in heaven and earth; that he is clothed with "the imperial purple of the universe," traveling in the greatness of his strength, mighty to save. It means the firmest assurance that nothing can separate from his love; it means the omnipotence of God in that aspect in which we are most interested—that of its exercise in the salvation of his people.

The omnipotence of God is the tacit assumption of every page and of every promise of Scripture. It is involved in the transcendent miracle of creation and inspires the final song of triumph, "The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth." It is seen in exercise in the redemption of God's people, in the punishment of his enemies, in the orderly processes of nature, in the grandeur of sea and stars. It is seen in miracles and wonders and signs, works of power and mercy, which cluster around the Incarnation or prepare the way for it. It is seen in spiritual transformations, in taking men from the horrible pit and planting their feet upon a rock. It is seen in its highest exercise in the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus from the dead as Prince of life and giver of eternal life to those who believe on him. It is a power accessible and available for every believer—"the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe."

In a time of spiritual disorder and disillusionment, in the ebb-tide of faith, it is good to think again of the almighty

power of God. If we can share the psalmist's faith and say with him, "Our help is in the name of the Lord who made heaven and earth," we can join with him in his praises, "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things; and let the whole earth be filled with his glory!"

Lincoln University, Pa. WM. HALLOCK JOHNSON.

(TO BE CONTINUED)

THE FOSSILS AS AGE-MARKERS IN GEOLOGY

Dr. William Bateson, in his Toronto address, December 28, 1921, which has already become a matter of much discussion, suggested the problem of how geologists are to prove that mammals may not have been living on the lands while the trilobites and the graptolites were living in the seas. In other words, how can we be sure that the trilobites may not have been contemporary with the ammonites and the dinosaurs and the mastodons? Though himself a convinced evolutionist, he admits that it is hard to prove a reliable chronological order for the various fossils; while in a subsequent communication to *Science*¹ he throws an additional bombshell into the camp of the magnavox evolutionists, by saying that "a naturalist acquainted with genetical discoveries would be as reluctant to draw conclusions as to the specific relationship of a series of fossils, as a chemist would be to pronounce on the nature of a series of unknown compounds from an inspection of them in a row of bottles."

It is not my intention to enlarge on the uncertainties which Mendelian discoveries have introduced into the work of the paleontologists, some of whom have felt confident that their work was pretty well settled. But people in general are very confident that, though scientists may not be able to tell the composition of the various compounds in a row of bottles, nevertheless the bottles are really *in a row*, and in a row which represents a true historical order. And such people can hardly be convicted of bad logic for believing in some sort of progress or development, or in other words for believing evolution somehow, "as an act of faith,"²

¹ April 7, 1922.

² See the address of Dr. H. D. Scott, before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at Edinburgh, Sept. 9, 1921. "For the moment, at all events, the Darwinian period is past . . . Yet evolution remains—we cannot get away from it, even if we hold it only as an act of faith, for there is no alternative, and, after all, the evidence of paleontology is unshaken" (*Nature*, Sept. 29, 1921). The chief object of the present paper is to study this problem of whether "the evidence of paleontology is unshaken."

when they see all the little bottles at one end of the shelf and a gradual progression from these to the big and much more handsome looking bottles at the other end.

It will be the purpose of the present paper to examine the entire subject of the geological order of the fossils; to see whether or not this commonly received order represents a true historical sequence, and thus to determine whether this geologic order of the forms of life is strong enough to serve as a foundation for a scheme of organic evolution.

It may be stated at the outset that we may accept the current geological classification of the rocks into the various *systems*, such as Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, and so on to the Pleistocene. That is, we accept the row of bottles, even though this arrangement in a row be an artificial one; they might as well be arranged in this order as in any other, and any orderly arrangement of a large mass of facts is a great mental convenience. This classification of the rocks is a good one, in that it is an orderly arrangement of the stratified rocks of the globe into groups each of which is characterized by some particular set of fossils. In other words, by Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, etc., or by their more minute subdivisions, we really mean *stratified rocks containing certain definite types of fossils*,³ no matter

³ Most people with only a smattering knowledge of geological methods think that stratigraphy is the chief guide in determining the relative ages of the various formations. Such people often resent with much vigor the statement that fossils are really the final court of appeal in all cases of uncertainty. It is true that stratigraphy is used to decide the succession in any local vertical section; but how are we to correlate the strata of one locality with those of another, where a real continuity cannot be made out? Grabau and Shimer have written a large work in two volumes entitled, *North American Index Fossils*; and a knowledge of the use made of such "index fossils" would answer such a question. Grabau tells us that the *Groups*, or primary divisions of the geological time-scale, are "based on the changes of life, with the result that fossils alone determine whether a formation belongs to one or the other of these great divisions" (*Principles of Stratigraphy*, p. 1103). H. S. Williams carries this same principle to the *Systems*: "The character of the rocks themselves, their composition, or their mineral contents have nothing to do with settling the question

GEOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATIONS

GROUP	SYSTEM	SERIES	Dominant Type of Life
CENOZOIC	Quaternary or Post-Tertiary or Pleistocene	Recent Terrace Drift (Glacial)	Man
	Tertiary	Pliocene Miocene Oligocene Eocene Paleocene	Mammals
MESOZOIC	Cretaceous	Upper or Cretaceous Proper Lower or Comanchean	Reptiles, Conifers and Palms
	Jurassic	Upper (Malm) Middle (Dogger) Lower (Lias)	
	Triassic	Upper (Keuper) Middle (Muschelkalk) Lower (Bunter Sandstein)	
PALEOZOIC	Permian	Upper Lower	Amphibians and Coal Plants
	Carboniferous	Pennsylvanian Mississippian	
	Devonian	Upper Middle Lower	Fishes and Insects
	Silurian	Upper or Monroan Middle or Salina Lower or Niagara	Invertebrates
	Ordovician	Upper or Cincinnati Middle or Champlainian Lower or Canadian	
	Cambrian	Saratogan Acadian Waucobian	
Primary or Primitive	Algonkian Archaean		Few Fossils or None

whether these rocks are shales, sandstones, or limestones; and therefore these names are very convenient handles when we have to deal with these various rocks and their fossil contents. We accept the bottles, and we accept their

as to the particular system to which the new rocks belong. The fossils alone are the means of correlation" (*Geol. Biology*, pp. 37, 38). In fact this principle is extended to the most minute subdivisions of the entire geological series. As we shall see later (page 602 ff.), if the evidence of stratigraphy contradicts the evidence of the fossils, so much the worse for the stratigraphy.

serial arrangement in a row; the question we are concerned with is: Is this a natural series, representing a true historical order; or is it a purely artificial series, representing merely a classification series of the ancient types of life that used to live at some time or times in the remote past?

As is well known, the various sets of beds, or *formations*, as they are termed, which compose any one of these *systems*, say the Devonian, are not found all together in any one locality. Some of the strata may be found in the south of England, some in Germany, some in New York State, some in South America, and so on around the world. But obviously these sets of strata are so widely separated that it would be out of the question to try to show any real stratigraphical connection between them. How then do geologists know how to arrange all these subdivisions of one of the systems in a true serial order?—for there is a serial arrangement of all the formations, or subdivisions, of each of these systems, just as there is a serial arrangement of all the systems into the whole geological series. Is this serial order of the formations or subdivisions of the system also an artificial one?

As no one claims that all the subdivisions of any one of the systems are to be found in any particular locality, but as for example the typical Devonian system is made up by piecing together the scattered formations from various parts of the world, it is clear that each of these systems themselves is made up in just the same way as the total geological series is made up of the various systems. Consequently if one of these series is artificial, the other is also. But as the names of the systems, such as Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous, etc., are more familiar to my readers than are the names of the more minute subdivisions of any one of these systems, it will be more convenient for us to deal with these larger groups, with the more familiar names, remembering all the time that whatever principles we discover as applying to these larger divisions will apply also *pro rata* to the smaller subdivisions.

Dealing then with these larger divisions or systems, we may ask ourselves whether the accepted series of the various systems really represents a true historical order. In other words, did the Cambrian forms of life live and die long ages before those of the Devonian, and the latter long before the Cretaceous forms?

In studying this problem there are two methods of attack, the abstract or logical, and the concrete or objective. Both are necessary; but by examining the abstract or logical aspects of the problem first, we can more readily understand the concrete or objective aspects of the subject, for of course the latter are the more important and conclusive.

For the more definite study of these subdivisions of our subject we may ask ourselves two quite distinct questions, these two questions really representing the abstract and the objective divisions respectively, which we have just spoken of; and by finding answers to these two questions, we will have solved our general problem.

These two questions may be stated as follows:

I. How can we be sure that the Cambrian faunas, for example, were once universal over the globe, or at least that no other distinct faunas (and floras), such as those of the Devonian, or the Cretaceous, or the Tertiary systems, could have been living contemporaneously in distant localities?

II. Do the formations (or the rocks containing certain types of fossils) always occur in the same order of sequence relative to one another?

THE EXTENT OF THE FOSSILIFEROUS STRATA

On taking up the first of these two points, we see how difficult it must be to prove that very different types of life might not have been living in distant regions, yet contemporary, in the long ago. For instance, who will have the hardihood, the real dogmatism, to affirm in a serious way that the Cambrian animals and seaweeds were for a long period the *only* forms of life existing anywhere on earth?

How can anyone be sure of such an alleged fact? Might not the Cretaceous dinosaurs, or even the titanotheres and the mastodons, have been living on the lands while the trilobites and other Cambrian sea creatures were living in the sea? Of course, it is hard to face such a contingency as this in an impartial way, on the part of one who has grown accustomed for long years to see all these various forms of life, with thousands of other specific examples, tabulated off in a precise and well-defined "historical" order. The very multiplicity of the examples in this alleged historical order, often seems to have a hypnotizing power over the mind, leading one to let down the bars and forget the strict rules of logic, under the strange impression that *quantity* will serve instead of *quality*, or that in the presence of a great number of examples which we can conveniently arrange in a certain order, we are permitted to dispense with strict logic in asking what this arrangement really signifies.

But if we deny that the trilobites and the graptolites were contemporary with the numulites and the ammonites we are in effect denying the possibility of zoological provinces and districts in the long ago. But the world in which we live, which is the only kind of a world of which we have actual scientific knowledge, is characterized by distinct floras and faunas in various habitats which we call provinces, districts, or zones. Can we affirm by any experimental knowledge that this sort of geographical distribution, or something of the same sort, did not prevail in the past, but that at some time in the long ago there was only one assemblage of life-forms throughout the globe, one grand habitat of one limited group of living things?

To some of those who have long been accustomed to the thought, it may seem axiomatic that a mere few of the lower types of life monopolized the globe for a long period of time, these in turn being followed by others.⁴ I admit that

⁴ Such a conception can, of course, never be proved objectively, except by the biological onion-coat process, with objective strati-

this is a conceivable and an understandable idea; but how are we to profess a *scientific knowledge* of this state of affairs, except by affirming either the one or the other of the two alternatives:

(1) Either that we have some supernatural knowledge of the past regarding this matter, and know that there could *not* have been biological provinces and districts in the long ago;

(2) Or, that we accept as proved some sort of biological onion-coat theory, with each of these successive floras and faunas absolutely universal over the globe one after another?

These are the two horns of the dilemma. There is no third possibility.

Now the earlier geologists, under the tutelage of A. G. Werner, did really postulate onion coats of successive kinds of minerals and rocks, in which they wrapped their embryo world.⁵ This doctrine was laughed out of existence in the early decades of the nineteenth century, when it became evident that these mineral onion coats were far from being universal, and that they often occurred in relative orders of sequence directly contrary to Werner's scheme.

But gradually and quite imperceptibly onion coats of fossiliferous strata were substituted for the mineral onion coats of Werner. The earlier workers really blended the two ideas together for a long time; and whenever the absurdity of this onion-coat theory was pointed out, they disclaimed it entirely and professed to be investigating merely local orders of succession. But, astonishing as it may appear, this method seems to have survived to our

graphical evidence to back it up from all over the globe. As a matter of fact, this conception is always an assumption, pure and simple. And it ought not to be necessary to point out that it in effect assumes, almost full size, the whole theory of organic evolution. How strange that so many people never realized this before!

⁵ Geikie says that Werner and his pupils "were as certain of the origin and sequence of the rocks, as if they had been present at the formation of the earth's crust" (*Founders of Geology*, p. 288). All of which has a strangely modern sound.

own day. The local succession is carefully investigated in every nook and corner of the globe, and it is freely admitted that any given set of beds is only of limited areal extent. It is freely acknowledged that it is quite impossible to follow even the most widely spread set of strata from one continent to another, or even across a single continent. And yet it is tacitly assumed, not only that the larger divisions or *systems* are universal over the globe, but that even the more minute subdivisions, the sub-stages and zones, as they are termed, are likewise of universal application.⁶ So that it is just as true today as it was over half a century ago, when Spencer sarcastically declared that, "though the onion-coat hypothesis is dead, its spirit is traceable, under a transcendental form, even in the conclusions of its antagonists."⁷

But as the geologists disclaim any supernatural knowledge of the past, such as would enable them to say that biologic provinces and districts did *not* exist in the early days of the world, and as they also seem ashamed of the onion-coat

⁶ Professor Suess asks how it is possible to assert "that particular horizons of various ages may be compared to or distinguished from other horizons over such large areas, that in fact the stratigraphical subdivisions extend over the entire globe" (*Face of the Earth*, Vol. I, p. 8). Specific examples of this minute correlation are to be found in the well-known graptolite zones, with identical or closely similar species, which "are found in Great Britain, the St. Lawrence and Champlain valleys, and in Australia" (Scott, *Introduction to Geology*, p. 572). We are also told that the more minute subdivisions of the Jurassic are similarly universal. "Even the minuter divisions, the sub-stages and zones of the European Jura, are applicable to the classification of the South American beds" (Scott, pp. 681f).

Suess and other geologists are amazed at this ghost of the old onion-coat theory. But there would be no cause whatever for surprise, if we could only comprehend that all these divisions of the geological scale, little and big, are purely artificial distinctions, based not on stratigraphy, but wholly on taxonomic considerations. And why should not a taxonomic series, if it is really a scientific one, be just as applicable in Australia, or Peru, or Alaska, or Florida, as in England or Germany?—providing, of course, we happen to find specimens with which to illustrate it.

⁷ *Illust. of Univ. Prog.*, pp. 329-380.

theory, since we know that no given set of fossiliferous beds could have been universal over the globe, we may conclude that neither of the two alternatives given above is logically defensible. From this we may safely conclude that there is no *a priori* method of defending the idea that the Cambrian animals lived and died before the Devonian or the Cretaceous. Accordingly, as we may take this much as settled, we are at liberty to pass on to the examination of the *second* of the heads of our subject, as stated above, namely, Do the formations, or groups of fossiliferous strata, always occur in the same relative order of sequence relative to one another all over the globe?

THE RELATIVE ORDER OF THE STRATA

Every geologist in the country would be prepared to answer this question affirmatively. In fact, this alleged invariable order of the formations is the chief if not the only argument for the reality of the successive geological ages. But this alleged invariable order is capable of objective examination. We can check up the facts, and see whether it is true or false. Fifty years ago we had not examined a sufficiently large fraction of the globe to be able to decide such a question intelligently. Now, however, while we are very far from having attained to a complete examination of the strata of the globe, we have accumulated a considerable amount of data, which ought to be sufficient to decide a simple matter like this. For the chief characteristic of an invariable order is that it is invariable; and it ought not to require any great number of exceptions to spoil its reputation for invariability,—providing, of course, that these exceptions are of a clear and unequivocal character. It does not require any great number of exceptions to a cashier's honesty to spoil his reputation for reliability.

There are two general aspects in which we may consider the relationships of the stratified deposits: first, their external relations, i. e. their relation to the Archaean and to the modern, to the primitive or non-fossiliferous rocks below

them and to the recent or post-geological (if I may be permitted to coin a word) rocks above them; second, their relation to one another.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND STRUCTURE

A. In considering the *external* relations of the fossiliferous strata, we find that the evidence may be briefly stated as follows:

(a) Any kind of fossiliferous rock (even the "youngest"), that is, strata belonging to any of the *systems* or other subdivisions, may rest directly upon the Archaean or primitive crystalline rocks, without any other so-called "younger" strata intervening;⁸ also these rocks, Permian, Cretaceous, Tertiary, or whatever, thus reposing directly on the Archaean, may be themselves crystalline or wholly metamorphic in texture. And this applies not alone to small points of contact, but to large areas.

Throughout much of Tennessee, eastern Mississippi, and extending into Alabama, the Cretaceous strata "overlap Paleozoic, and in Georgia they rest on the more ancient crystallines."⁹ Over much of the Rocky Mountain region, the Triassic beds rest directly upon the Archaean or Pre-Cambrian (of course, unconformably); and similar conditions extend southward from this over the greater part of Mexico and Central America. In Jamaica and Cuba, the Cretaceous rest directly upon the old crystallines.¹⁰ The Mesozoic strata usually occur in this position through Saxony and Bohemia; and it was on this account that they were formerly called the "secondary" rocks, in the early days of geology. Throughout much of California, the Tertiary formations (Eocene and Miocene) often occur on the old granites and gneisses.

It is not necessary to give further examples of a fact so generally understood by all students of the rocks.

⁸ But of course there is always a marked *unconformity* between the Archaean or Primitive rocks, and the true stratigraphical formations.

⁹ Schuchert, *Textbook*, p. 899; Ed. of 1915.

¹⁰ Grabau, *Comprehensive Geol.*, Vol. II, pp. 696, 697.

The other part of this fact, that even the "youngest" strata may be highly metamorphosed or crystalline, can be illustrated by a few examples. In the Sierra Nevada range, the gold-bearing Jurassic slates are in this condition; while the Tertiary of the Coast Range and of other parts of California "are folded or otherwise altered so that they are as much consolidated as are formations of the Paleozoic."¹¹ The Eocene schists and gneisses of the Alps, and the Eocene marbles of the Himalayas are also highly crystalline. The Pleistocene Nagelfluh of Salzburg, Austria, is a well known example of "young" beds which have nevertheless become highly consolidated; for the chapels and rooms carved out of these rocks in the third century as catacombs are still in an almost perfect state of preservation. At Lewiston, on the Niagara River, near the railway station, is a similar example of Pleistocene rock so hard as to require a hammer to break it. In fact, this is a general principle, applicable to "all the formations, from the earliest to the latest."¹²

(b) But the converse of this principle which we have been considering is equally important. It may be stated as follows: Any kind of fossiliferous strata may not only constitute the surface rocks over wide areas, but may consist of loose unconsolidated materials, thus in both position and texture resembling the "late" Tertiaries or the Pleistocene.

The Cambrian rocks around the Baltic Sea, and also in Wisconsin, may be given as examples. In these instances, "the rocks still retain their original horizontality of deposition, the muds are scarcely indurated, and the sands are still incoherent."¹³ Even the Penokee series of the Lake Superior district, regarded as a subdivision of the Algonkian or Pre-Cambrian, is in about the same unaltered and unconsolidated condition.¹⁴

¹¹ Schuchert, *Textbook*, p. 911.

¹² Dana, *Manual*, p. 408.

¹³ J. A. Howe, *Encycl. Brit.*; Vol. V, p. 86.

¹⁴ W. J. Sollas, *Age of the Earth*, pp. 29, 30.

The same is true of certain instances of the Ordovician rocks, the system rated as next in age to the Cambrian. "Across northern Russia, Ordovician rocks cover a great area; they consist of clays, bituminous and calcareous shales, sands, and marls . . . they lie flat and undisturbed . . . the sands and clays are as soft and incoherent as the similar rocks of Tertiary age in the south of England."¹⁵

In Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama, the Cretaceous beds are of a similar character. They comprise unconsolidated gravels, sands, and clays, and they have every physical appearance of being in reality as young as any "late" Tertiary or Pleistocene beds. The Cretaceous beds may not be regarded as extremely old, speaking geologically, yet according to the current theory they are at least a good many millions of years old, sufficiently ancient, at any rate, to make it quite incredible that they should still be in this soft unconsolidated condition. Their physical appearance is most certainly against their alleged great age.

To my notion, there is nothing very wonderful about either these Cretaceous, or the Ordovician or Cambrian beds being unconsolidated; though these facts are regarded by the believers in the current theories as extremely remarkable.

However, in the light of the first of these two principles, about the relation of the fossiliferous strata to the primitive or Archaean, it is difficult to see where we are to go to *start* the geological succession. In other words, since any kind of fossiliferous formation may be found occurring directly on the Archaean, and extending over wide areas, where shall we go to find some kind of fossil-bearing rocks which we can prove to be really older than all others?

INTERNAL SEQUENCE

B. Having now considered the relationships of stratified rocks to the Archaean or primitive, and also to the recent, or to the surface conditions, we must next consider

¹⁵ J. A. Howe, Article *Encycl. Brit.*, Vol. XX, pp. 236, 237.

them with reference to one another. Do they always occur in an invariable order of sequence relative to one another?

“MISSING LINKS” IN EXISTING STRATA

In connection with this subject, there is no need to dwell on the great principle of *superposition*, that in any undisturbed section of strata the lower beds must have been deposited before the ones above them. But the principle of *conformity* will naturally call for some explanation. In examining two contiguous beds or layers, if the upper one is parallel with the lower, and if there is no physical evidence of any disturbance of the lower bed or any erosion of its surface before the upper one was laid upon it, we say that there is *conformity* between the two, or that the upper one is *conformable* with the lower. In case the lower strata have been tilted up at any angle whatever, the next set of beds lying across the upturned edges of the lower ones, there is said to be an *angular unconformity* between them. In this case, it is commonly assumed that an immense lapse of time must have occurred between the laying down of these two sets of beds; and that the lower beds were lifted up above the ocean and then base-levelled off by subaerial erosion. But this is not at all necessary. Such a phenomenon might only indicate a seismic disturbance of the bed of a body of water, and a change of current which brought new sediment over on top of the tilted bottom,—all of which could conceivably occur between two successive tides.

In case the two contiguous strata are strictly parallel with each other, but the lower one shows some erosion of its surface before the upper one was spread out upon it, it is spoken of as a case of *evident disconformity*. But it frequently happens, as we shall presently see, that a set of beds classed as comparatively “young” is found in apparent conformity upon another set regarded (because of its fossils) as much older; and in this instance a special term is used, such an instance being called a “*non-evident disconformity*.” Still, as instances like these are the chief ones

about which any discussion occurs, the term "disconformity" is often used for them. Or they may be called "*deceptive conformities*," a term which seems to be very expressive, implying that one would never suspect the long interval of time, sometimes of many million years, which according to the current theories passed away between the deposition of these two successive layers. Because we naturally consider that a real conformity between two successive beds indicates *substantial continuity of deposition*, a slight break and short time interval having occurred, such as might take place between two currents, or between two successive tides, or even a flow and an ebb. Certainly, if we are to judge by physical evidence alone, and adopt a critical attitude toward alleged discrepancies in age between the two beds based on their contained "index fossils," we could never suppose that there had been a great hiatus between them, perhaps measured by many millions of years.

Let us study a few specific examples, the first being from near Banff, Alberta: "East of the main divide, the Lower Carboniferous is overlaid in places by beds of Lower Cretaceous age, and here again, although the two formations differ so widely in respect to age, one overlies the other without any perceptible break, and the separation of one from the other is rendered more difficult by the fact that the upper beds of the Carboniferous are lithologically almost precisely like those of the Cretaceous [above them]. Were it not for fossil evidence, one would naturally suppose that a single formation was being dealt with."¹⁶ Here the Upper Carboniferous, the Permian, the Triassic, and the Jurassic are absent.

Take another example from Athabasca, northern Canada: "The Devonian limestone is apparently succeeded conformably by the Cretaceous; and, with the possible exception of a thin bed of conglomerate of limited extent, which occurs below Crooked Rapid on the Athabasca, the age of which is doubtful, the vast interval of time which separated the

¹⁶ Canadian *Annual Report*, New Series, Vol. 2, Part A, p. 8.

two formations is, so far as observed, unrepresented either by deposition or erosion.”¹⁷ In this case the entire Carboniferous, the Permian, the Triassic, and the Jurassic are absent, the strata giving every physical appearance that these alleged “ages” never existed at all in these localities. Not only is this a case of perfect conformity, but it is a limestone followed by a similar limestone. Are we to suppose that after this Devonian limestone was deposited, nature served an injunction on any further action of the elements, and everything continued in the *status quo* for all these millions of years, until nature was ready to spread out another similar limestone over this first one?

We cannot dwell upon these examples with that attention which they deserve. We must pass on to others.

In the Bear Grass quarries, at Louisville, Kentucky, a coral limestone classed as Middle Devonian occurs directly upon an almost exactly similar-looking coral limestone which, because it carries different fossils, is classed as Middle Silurian. And yet, “the absolute conformability of the beds can be traced for nearly a mile,” and “the parting between these two zones is like that between any two limestone beds; but this insignificant line represents a stratigraphic hiatus equivalent to the last third of Silurian and the first third of Devonian time.”¹⁸

Near Newsom, Tennessee, a Middle Devonian limestone occurs conformably on a Middle Silurian limestone, as in the previous instance. It would not be at all unreasonable to suppose that this conformity continues beneath the surface over all the 200 miles between these two localities; for geologists usually assume a continuity of the beds between two such neighboring outcrops.

An additional interest attaches to this latter example, since another deceptive conformity occurs above these Middle Devonian beds, which are only some six feet thick; for they are covered conformably by Mississippian (Lower Carbon-

¹⁷ *Annual Report*, N. S., Vol. 5, Part D, p. 52.

¹⁸ Schuchert, *Textbook*, p. 587.

iferous) shales, the Upper Devonian being absent. Thus we have a double example of deceptive conformity in this vertical section.

A similar double case occurs at Buffalo, N. Y., while a noted single case covers a large part of eastern Tennessee. In the latter case, Lower Carboniferous black shales rest conformably on gray clays of the Lower Silurian, the upper two-thirds of the Silurian and all of the Devonian being absent. Further complications occur in this latter instance because of an extensive interfingering or intercalation of the one with the other, so that it is extremely difficult to draw the line between the two sets of beds. Such phenomena, however, are far from being uncommon elsewhere.

"Throughout northeastern China, in the provinces of Chi-li, Shan-si, Shan-tung, and Ho-nan, there is an unconformity [deceptive conformity] which brings the Ordovician in contact with the Carboniferous . . . The hiatus appears, therefore, to represent later Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, and lower Carboniferous times. Local observations all agree that the Ordovician and the Carboniferous strata are strictly conformable; so closely parallel are they that von Richthofen, who repeatedly saw the contact, assumed that they formed an unbroken sequence."¹⁹

Another example, which has become famous in the literature because of having been reported so long ago, is on the Dwina, in northern Russia, where Pleistocene beds occur in "absolute conformable superposition on horizontal Permian sediments."²⁰

Let us turn from the consideration of specific examples, which might be continued indefinitely, and notice some more general statements.

Darwin alluded to "many cases"²¹ of this sort. Again,

¹⁹ Bailey Willis, *Research in China*, Vol. II, p. 67. Richthofen classified both series together under the name of Kohlenkalk, or Carboniferous.

²⁰ Suess, *Face of the Earth*, Vol. II, p. 543. This case was first described by Murchison, nearly a hundred years ago.

²¹ *Origin*, Vol. II, p. 58; Sixth Ed.

Geikie, in speaking of how "fossil evidence may be made to prove the existence of gaps which are not otherwise apparent," says that "it is not so easy to give a satisfactory account of those which occur where the strata are strictly conformable, and where no evidence can be observed of any considerable change of physical conditions at the time of deposit. A group of quite conformable strata, having the same general lithological characters throughout, may be marked by a great discrepancy between the fossils of the upper and the lower part." In many cases, he says, these conditions are "not merely local, but persistent over wide areas . . . They occur abundantly among the European Paleozoic and Secondary rocks," and are "traceable over wide regions."²²

Suess speaks of the "numerous examples" of this sort, which he terms "concordant superposition of the more recent beds on those of much greater age," saying that these comparatively "young" rocks are often found resting "in perfect concordance on much older beds, so that the stratigraphical relations offer no hint of the great gap which occurs at the line of contact."²³ All of which, as he well expresses it, "may well be cause for astonishment."

It would be tedious to multiply quotations along this line. I give but one more, from Dr. E. O. Ulrich, of the U. S. Geological Survey: "A break corresponding to several geological periods may be no more clearly marked than the relatively brief interruption of sedimentation between two small formations, or between diastrophically distinguished members of a single formation." After quoting several examples to illustrate his meaning, he goes on to say: "It makes little difference whether the compared sequences are lithologically similar or dissimilar; the large hiatuses are, as a

²² *Textbook*, p. 842. One of the most experienced paleontologists in America recently told the present writer that he himself has probably seen and examined a thousand examples of this character, some of them covering areas equal to one or more States.

²³ *Face of the Earth*, Vol. II, p. 543.

rule, no more clearly defined than the small breaks.”²⁴ All of which, as it seems to me, can have only one possible meaning, namely, that these long intervals of time between these conformable and often lithologically identical formations, *never really existed*. If physical facts, or objective evidence, are to have the right of way over speculative theories, then surely there must be something wrong with that theory which assigns successive periods of immense duration to the different kinds of animals and plants; for obviously in the instances which we have been considering, and which are to be found literally by the thousand throughout the world, these various formations, contrary to the current theory that they were separated by millions of years, must have followed one another quite quickly. If we take their evidence at its face value, this theory of a definite historical value for the various fossils must be given up.

At any rate, we have ample warrant for formulating a scientific law to cover the instances which we have been considering. This law would be about like this:—Any sort of fossiliferous formation may occur on top of any other “older” fossiliferous formation, with all the physical evidences of perfect conformity, just as if these alleged incongruous or mismated formations had in reality followed one another in quick succession.

STRATA IN “INVERTED ORDER”

But we must pass on to consider those examples which may not untruthfully be characterized in a brief way as deceptive conformities *upside down*. True, they do not pass under any such name in the literature of the science. In common geological parlance they are called “thrusts” or “thrust faults.” Some years ago, when such examples were first discovered, they were called “overthrust folds,” this name embalming in it the theory designed to explain the phenomena. And the very fact that these phenomena have been thus differently interpreted, well illustrates the truth-

²⁴ *Bull. Geol. Soc. of Amer.*, Vol. XXII, p. 459.

fulness of Dr. Albert Heim's characterization of this problem, in a letter to me a good many years ago. That the strata over wide areas are actually in an order the reverse of the accepted geological succession, is, he said, "a fact which can be clearly seen—only we know not yet how to explain it in a mechanical way." My whole idea is that we do not need to "explain" these phenomena in any way, but just take them as they stand, take them at their face value, for what they seem to mean. This, in essence, is the entire point of difference between my position and that of other geologists. These cases of "thrust faults" in reality constitute the very crux of all modern discussion of geological theories,—I might almost say the crux of all modern discussion about organic evolution.

But preliminary to any detailed study of these phenomena, we ought to note some precautionary remarks which one finds frequently in works of a general nature, or in text-books, designed to prepare the mind of the student for the consideration of such phenomena. Here is one from H. Alleyne Nicholson, the noted Scotch paleontologist: "It may even be said that in any case where there should appear to be a clear and decisive discordance between the physical and the paleontological evidence as to the age of a given series of beds, it is the former that is to be distrusted rather than the latter."²⁵

Similar directions to the student beginning the study of chemistry, or physics, or indeed any other of the natural sciences, would be considered too grotesquely unscientific to be tolerated for a moment. The real humour of the situation, however, is that this rule, as stated by Nicholson, has actually been followed by geologists for over a generation, and still serves to settle all controversy about the age of any newly discovered deposits.

Geikie says substantially the same thing, in telling how we can prove the reality of great earth movements: "We may even demonstrate that in some mountainous ground

²⁵ *Ancient Life History of the Earth*, p. 40.

the strata have been turned completely upside down, if we can show that the fossils in what are now the uppermost layers ought properly to lie underneath those in the beds below them."²⁶

I sincerely believe that such a statement will some day be regarded as one of the literary curiosities in the history of scientific theories. Readers of these quotations who have been trained in other sciences, or who have had some training in any other mental discipline whatever, will quite understand the remark which is often heard from geologists that their science has its own standards of proof and its own methods of reasoning. And such readers can also understand why the specialists in geology indignantly resent any interference with their methods by "outsiders."

Here is still another tit-bit from the same monumental work of the illustrious Director of the Geological Survey of Great Britain, regarding certain conditions in the Alps: "The strata could scarcely be supposed to have been really inverted, save for the evidence as to their true order of succession supplied by their included fossils . . . Portions of Carboniferous strata appear as if regularly interbedded among Jurassic rocks, and indeed could not be separated save after a study of their enclosed organic remains."²⁷

Comment on such a statement is unnecessary.

The theory of "pioneer colonies" was invented by Barande about 1852, to explain many such examples of the strata in reverse order, where the differences in age do not happen to be too great. This theory is still made use of to explain the very surprising sequence of such examples as the Pikermi beds in Greece, which contain typical Miocene fossils, but rest on late Pliocene strata; or the Gondwanas of India, which have a Triassic flora interbedded between a Jurassic flora below and another Triassic fauna above; or the Newcastle beds of Australia, where a Jurassic flora is interbedded with a Lower Carboniferous fauna, with

²⁶ *Textbook*, p. 837, (Ed. of 1903).

²⁷ *Textbook*, p. 678.

Permian beds over all. A few cases nearer home would be the Lance formation of the Plains region of North America, where fossil plants always regarded as Tertiary have an undisputed Cretaceous fauna above them; or the Anderdon limestones of Michigan, Ohio, and Ontario, which contain an extensive "pioneer colony" of middle Devonian fossils interbedded with Silurian strata.

Much used to be written about "recurrent faunas," where what were termed "immigrant" groups or faunas are found recurring over and over again among formations classed as of an entirely different age. H. S. Williams was the first to call attention to these examples of "recurrent faunas." When he began his scientific work, it was a cardinal doctrine among other geologists that a distinct set of fossils always characterizes each geological formation. Williams soon found that there are important exceptions to this rule. As his biographer remarks: "In studying the Devonian formations about Ithaca, he found that the so-called characteristic fossils of the Hamilton formation, for example, also occur in certain beds in the Ithaca; that in the Ithaca group there is 'first a Portage fauna, then the Ithaca fauna; third the Portage fauna again, and finally the Chemung, capped by the Catskill and Carboniferous.' This discovery, fundamental as it is, was not immediately welcome to all paleontologists, because, as one said, 'How is one to be sure of the age of any formation, if one cannot depend upon the characteristic fossils?'"

E. O. Ulrich has discussed this subject at considerable length, and he gives a list of several instances of these "recurrent faunas" from North America. One of these had three "recurrences," another two, and another five; and he suggests the very natural query as to whether the value of "index fossils" has not been seriously impaired by these facts. He argues that these phenomena do not materially affect the value of fossil evidence; but it must be said that they ought to have some weight, at least, in considering the

problem which is under consideration, namely, whether or not the fossils always occur in the same invariable order of sequence.²⁸

What was long called the Glarus "double fold," was one of the first examples to be discovered of strata in reverse order which could not well be explained by any of the devices or hypotheses hitherto devised. The Sernf valley, in the canton of Glarus, Switzerland, is composed of Lower Tertiary (Flysch) beds, while the mountains on both sides are capped by Permian strata, with Jurassic strata still higher in stratigraphic sequence. From about 1870 onward, these conditions were explained by Escher, Heim, and others as having been due to a real double fold of the Permian and Mesozoic rocks from both sides in toward the middle over the Sernftal; but after a voluminous amount of discussion of the mechanics of the problem, the theory of a flat-lying thrust all from one direction, was adopted by most geologists, and was accepted by Heim himself in 1903. In an address given at Zurich in 1907, Dr. Heim speaks of these flat-lying thrust faults as being "a universal phenomenon in the northern and central Alps."²⁹

Such noted peaks as the Matterhorn, the Dent Blanche, and the Weisshorn are parts of immense masses which are now said to have been pushed bodily over on top of the underlying strata, because the latter contain fossils classed as much younger. As geologists became accustomed to this idea of immense mountain masses' having been thrust many miles across the face of the country, they gradually acquired a degree of courage in inventing adequate hypotheses, until now there is no hesitation in postulating a thrust of this nature which resulted in "pushing the southern or Lepontine Alps about 60 miles to the northward into the Helvetic region."³⁰

²⁸ Revision of the Paleozoic Systems, *Geol. Soc. of Amer. Bulletin*, Vol. 22, (1911), p. 298.

²⁹ *Der Bau der Schweizeralpen*, p. 17.

³⁰ Schuchert, *Textbook*, p. 924.

The details of these phenomena will be found discussed in learned treatises in German and French by such writers as Rothpletz,³¹ Heim, Schardt, Lugeon, and others. We must pass along to notice briefly some similar conditions in the Highlands of Scotland. Dana, speaking of these, remarks that "the thrust planes look like planes of bedding, and were long so considered."³²

Some of these examples of "old" strata on top of "younger" had been at first described as instances of normal sequence, before the fossil evidence had been discovered which forbade such a normal condition. And Geikie, in correcting the former descriptions and in assigning the true names for these rocks, justifies the former mistakes by saying that these rocks look amazingly natural. "Had these sections," he says, "been planned for the purpose of deception, they could not have been more skilfully devised, . . . and no one coming first to this ground would suspect that what appears to be a normal stratigraphical sequence is not really so."³³

One of the most unequivocal examples of the rocks in inverted order, is that in Alberta and Montana, about 500 miles long from north to south. I have dealt quite fully with this example in one of my earlier works,³⁴ and need not enter into details here. A few outstanding features of this case will not however be amiss.

The area here involved extends from west of Great Falls, Montana, northward to the Yellowhead Pass, in Alberta, and is remarkably uniform throughout in its physical features,

³¹ Rothpletz, in describing the district around Glarus, says that one of the mountain masses must have travelled "from east to west a distance of twenty-five miles from the Rhine Valley to the Linth;" while further east, he says, the Rhaetikon Mountain mass traveled from the Montafon Valley to the Rhine Valley, about nineteen miles from east to west" (*Nature*, Jan. 24, 1901, p. 294). When these theories were first propounded, they almost took the breath of some; now they are regarded as quite commonplace.

³² *Manual*, p. 534; Fourth Edition.

³³ *Nature*, Nov. 13, 1884.

³⁴ *The Fundamentals of Geology*, pp. 86-104.

though paleontological complications are introduced into the problem because of the fact that the mountains on the American side of the line, or throughout the Glacier National Park, are classed as Algonkian or Pre-Cambrian, while further north the mountains (of almost identical structure lithically and physically) are variously classed as Cambrian, or Permo-Carboniferous. But in all cases, from north to south, the underlying rocks are always Cretaceous, usually consisting of soft shales or in some cases of sandstones. These Cretaceous strata not only run under the bold precipitous limestones and quartzites comprising the front ranges of the Rockies in these latitudes, but the same Cretaceous beds appear also at the rear of the Glacier National Park in the valley of the North Fork of the Flathead, where many outcrops of oil shale and coal-bearing beds have lately been exploited. Further north, in Alberta, there are several long valleys running north and south, coal mines being worked in some of them, these Cretaceous strata being remarkably horizontal throughout this whole area, even the Paleozoic rocks comprising the mountain tops often extending in a remarkably even course across the skyline for immense distances, the entire absence of vegetation greatly assisting the study of these phenomena. Such well known peaks as Chief Mountain, Crowsnest Mountain, and Mount Assiniboin, called the Matterhorn of the Rockies, being isolated outliers, are more impressive; but the entire Glacier National Park might be regarded as in one sense of the word a gigantic Algonkian outlier, or rather a peninsula, floating on a Cretaceous sea.

Throughout this vast area, which covers from 10,000 to 20,000 square miles,³⁵ there are dozens perhaps hundreds of exposures where the upper strata can be seen resting in apparent conformity on the underlying Cretaceous. A few

³⁵ As variously estimated, according to the width of the area which we may suppose may have these Paleozoic rocks lying on the Cretaceous.

descriptions of these contacts may serve to give the reader a better picture of the real situation.

R. G. McConnell, of the Canadian Survey, thus describes the appearance of one exposure to the east of Banff, where he says that the line of contact between the underlying Cretaceous shales and the overlying Paleozoic limestones, called by the theory the "thrust plane," acts exactly like an ordinary stratification plane. "The angle of inclination of its plane to the horizon is very low, and in consequence of this its outcrop follows a very sinuous line along the base of the mountains, and acts exactly like the line of contact of two nearly horizontal formations." He further says that at the Gap of the Bow River, "the fault plane here is nearly horizontal, and the two formations, viewed from the valley, appear to succeed one another conformably."³⁶ He adds the further naïve remark that the underlying Cretaceous shales are "very soft," and "have suffered little by the sliding of the limestones over them."³⁷

The area to the south of the international boundary line has been much more completely described in geological literature, this part having been repeatedly gone over by such men as Campbell, Stanton, Bailey Willis, and many others. The latter has written a very interesting paper³⁸ dealing quite fully with the region just south of the boundary line, and offering some good photographs and good word pictures of such salient features as Chief Mountain.

³⁶ *Annual Report*, 1886, Part D, pp. 33, 34. On another page this author speaks of other instances of a true semblance of a natural conformity. "The apparent conformity is perfect, even in the clearest sections; and the difficulty in drawing an exact line between the two series is further increased by the close lithological resemblance" between them. (p. 17). He further says that the resemblance (in this particular locality) between the two series is "so close that it becomes impossible in many places to separate them without fossil evidence."

³⁷ P. 84.

³⁸ *Bull. Geol. Soc.*, Vol. 13, pp. 305-352. See also Calhoun, Prof. Paper No. 50, p. 10. G. M. Dawson made the first survey of the features on the Canadian side; see "Annual Report," 1885, Part B, p. 67.

What is called the "Bannock Overthrust" is described by Richards and Mansfield,³⁹ who say that it "extends approximately 270 miles from the vicinity of Woodruff, Utah, to the north of John Grays Lake," Idaho. Several similar "thrusts" lie parallel to this to the east, in the State of Wyoming, the authors alleging that these are in some fashion connected with the area already described to the north. Other large areas in the Plains region have lately been described as showing similar examples of the rocks in the wrong order.

Several instances occur in the eastern United States. One such in the southern Appalachians of eastern Tennessee and northern Georgia consists of nearly horizontal Cambrian or Lower Silurian beds lying on top of Carboniferous. It is described as "almost identical" (McConnell) with the phenomena in Alberta, and is said to have a length of 375 miles.⁴⁰ The conditions here, as Willis says,⁴¹ "have provoked the wonder of the most experienced geologists," because of the extraordinary way in which these "thrust planes" resemble stratification planes.

It would be tiresome to follow these phenomena around the world. The Salt Range of India is now said to be really composed of Tertiary strata, with Cambrian beds resting upon them.⁴² The Carnegie Research Expedition in Asia reported one of these great "thrusts" extending across northern China for some 500 miles,⁴³ though the extent to which such features prevail in this region "is not yet determinable."

A paper by Chamberlain and Miller in the *Journal of Geology*⁴⁴ is an attempt to deal with the general aspects of this

³⁹ *Journal of Geology*, Nov.-Dec., 1912.

⁴⁰ Bailey Willis, U. S. Geol. Survey, "Annual Report," Vol. 13, p. 228; See also, C. W. Hayes, *Bull. Geol. Soc. of Amer.*, Vol. 2, pp. 141-154.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 228.

⁴² Grabau, *Comprehensive Geology*, Part II, p. 255; 1921.

⁴³ *Research in China*, Vol. 2, p. 90.

⁴⁴ Jan.-Feb., 1918.

problem. It is entitled: "Low-Angle Faulting," and it endeavors to group all these phenomena into a class by themselves. The authors list several other examples from Spain, the Balkans, and elsewhere, and point out how all normal faults are always at a high angle, approaching the vertical; while these "thrust faults" are practically horizontal, and thus "constitute a phenomenon of a definite, independent type." They further say that, "The distinguishing features of the overthrusts are the extremely low angle, which often approaches horizontality, and the very great displacement along the plane of slippage."⁴⁵

It would lead us too far afield to describe the laboratory experiments with pressure boxes, designed to show how various kinds of materials would behave under strong lateral pressure. Wonderful diagrams have been drawn, with great arcs of circles miles high in the air, to show where the strata once were, apparently under the conviction that anything which could possibly be drawn, or anything which could be proved mechanically possible with pressure apparatus on a small scale, would be legitimately allowable as an explanation of these field conditions, where the strata are so obviously in the "wrong" order. But how singular to witness in this third decade of the twentieth century methods of reconciling obvious facts with a theory supposed to be infallible, which so closely resemble the epicycles and other inventions of the Ptolemaic astronomers, designed to escape the plain meaning of facts then recently discovered in the heavens. Yet how both these cases do illustrate the great truth that a false hypothesis will effectually blind the eyes of observers, just as a gift has been said to blind the eyes of a judge in court.

CONCLUSIONS

If now we attempt to gather up the threads of our argument we shall see that we have made some definite progress. We have been studying the question, Do the rocks occur in

⁴⁵ P. 43.

an invariable order of relative sequence? And we have found that they really occur in every conceivable order of sequence. At first we examined their relationships to the underlying Archaean and to the recent. This was followed by an examination of their relationship to one another under the head of *conformity*. In the last division of our subject we have likewise been considering their relationship to one another under the head of what we may term *upside-down conformities*, or what are usually called "thrust faults" or "overthrusts." And our results under these last two divisions may well be summed up under a general law, which I have elsewhere termed the great *Law of Conformable Stratigraphical Sequence*, which I believe to be by all odds the most important generalization yet formulated with reference to the order in which the stratified deposits occur with reference to one another.

This law may be stated as follows: *Any fossiliferous formation, "old" or "young," may occur conformably on any other fossiliferous formation, "younger" or "older."*

Doubtless it will be quite unnecessary to point out that, if this law is scientifically established as a true record of observed phenomena, then no fossils can any longer be regarded as intrinsically older or younger than others. We may still deal with the standard "index fossils," as good guides or markers for our various classifications of the strata; but the time value so long associated with these relics of ancient life is gone forever in the judgment of every person who is acquainted with scientific methods, and who has enough rudimentary knowledge of logic to recognize when a point is really proved.

In reality our geological classification of the strata according to their fossil contents, is only a sort of elaborate card-index system. We have already spoken of the limited areal extent of any set of stratified beds, and also of the way which the strata from many scattered localities have been assembled to make any one of the Systems complete.

Hence the purely artificial character of the geological classification must be recognized, just as every compiler of a library catalogue realizes the artificial make-up of his card index. We all know that when any new strata are found in Alaska, in Borneo, at Cape Horn, or in the interior of Africa, it is very easy to find a place for them in this card-index system. And this place in the established scheme would be based wholly on the fossils contained in these strata, provided these fossils happened to be of a distinctive character, or good "index fossils," and quite irrespective of whether these strata were soft or crystalline, and irrespective of their color, or even of their stratigraphic relationship with the beds above them or below them in the field. Moreover, if, long after it has been catalogued, some one points out that this set of beds has been wrongly listed, it is also simplicity itself to shift such a set of beds up or down, as may be required; for such readjustments are constantly going on, a committee existing at the United States Geological Survey at Washington, D. C., to determine and settle such matters. But it would surely be ludicrous for a librarian to take his card index so seriously as to claim that all his books listed under *A*, *B*, and *C* were actually printed long before those listed under *X*, *Y*, and *Z*. Most people would think that such a person needed a legal guardian.

This is not the place to discuss the logical consequences which follow from this changed view regarding the meaning of the fossils as the time-markers in geology. I have discussed this matter elsewhere.⁴⁶ Suffice it to say in this connection that in the light of the facts brought out in the previous pages we can no longer feel that confidence in the fossils as true age-markers which we used to feel. To put it very mildly, we can no longer feel sure that a certain formation is very old because it contains Cambrian fossils, or that a certain other formation is very young because

⁴⁶ See the author's *Q. E. D.; Back to the Bible; Fundamentals of Geology*, etc.

it contains Tertiary remains. The other common-sense criteria of age are still left us, and must still be used to determine as best we can the relative ages of the various deposits. But to continue to speak and write as if the "index fossils" are anything more than good checks on the taxonomic classification of these ancient life forms, or as if they are in any sense whatever true guides to the age of the rocks in which they are found, is to fly in the very face of a thousand facts wholly clear and unambiguous. As for the theories of the development of life which have been based largely on this long-accepted historical series of plants and animals as furnished by geology, I am sorry for those who have held these theories.

But what if we take these examples of deceptive conformity and of conformity upside down, at their face value? For one thing, we will have an enormous collection of the various types of life of all grades, from the shell-fish up to prodigious dinosaurs and imperial elephants, which manifestly became extinct in some strange way and the bodies of which were buried in enormous numbers by moving water, probably sea water. Surely it is not the fault of this clear induction of modern science, that the earliest traditions of every race on earth give us the story of a world convulsion, a flood, that seems to be the exact historical counterpart of this that we are now reading in the light of modern science from those contemporary vouchers in stone. And just as surely, the hackneyed protest of uniformitarianism that such a world convulsion is quite impossible, can no longer be regarded in the face of the abundant scientific evidence which we now possess that it was a reality. More things have evidently happened to our world in the long ago than Hutton and Lyell ever dreamt of in their philosophy.

Back of this world catastrophe, lies the problem of the origin of the various types of life. But this is now a very different problem from that absurdity which uniformitarian geology so long held up before us, of a creation on the

instalment plan. True inductive geology will never degenerate into a cosmogony. It cannot tell us how life in all of its various forms originated. But since we have no scientific reasons for affirming that one type of life is intrinsically older than another, the new geology has cleared the ground of all possible schemes of development in some definite order. The problem of the origin of things belong, neither to geology nor to any other of the natural sciences. Inductive geology will never presume to solve this problem; but it points upward.

College View, Nebr.

GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE.

PETER MARTYR AND THE COLLOQUY OF POISSY

This session of September 26th was the last public meeting of the Colloquy of Poissy. They were at this conference, moans D'Espence, until after six o'clock, and yet nothing was decided.⁹⁶ Nevertheless, Catherine did not give up all hope. Thoroughly displeased with action which, as Martyr puts it, seemed unworthy of royal presence, she determined not to attend future meetings, and at the same time reduced the personnel of the conference to a committee of ten: five of the more moderate collocutors on the Romanist side, who were to confer with five from the Protestant side. The former were: Jean Montluc, Bishop of Valence; DuVal, Bishop of Séez (Sagensis); Drs. Bottiller and Salignac, both abbots; and Dr. Claude d'Espence. The Protestant representatives were: Theodore Beza, Nicholas des Gallars (Gallasius), Augustin Malorat, Jean de L'Espine (Spina), and Peter Martyr. For each side secretaries were appointed. "But," Martyr adds, "being without judges and other witnesses we converse friendly and quietly enough. For, as I see it, we have adversaries mild enough, and who do not differ much from us." By October 2nd, when the above words were written, Martyr notes that they had held three meetings, in which only the subject of the bodily presence in the Supper was discussed.⁹⁷ Already, on September

⁹⁵ Klipffel, *op. cit.*, p. 123, says the discussion become so heated that they did not perceive the approach of night. Despence, quoted by De Ruble (p. 39), also notes that it was six o'clock when the meeting broke up. "Itaque Regina jubente solutus est conventus, cum iam nox esset" are Martyr's words in his letter (Oct. 2) to Bullinger. [This footnote belongs at the end of the last article. It was omitted through an oversight.—Ed.]

⁹⁶ As cited in De Ruble, p. 39. D'Espence here adds that if the Huguenots had admitted the article on the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, other articles would have received more attention.

⁹⁷ For the above and list of names of this commission, see Martyr's letter to Bullinger, Oct. 2nd. Baum, *Beza*, II. 387. Baird, *op. cit.*,

25th, D'Espence and Montluc had conferred with Beza and des Gallars, and these four had patched up an agreement which was to form a basis for discussion by the newly-appointed decemvir. The Committee of Ten met for the first time on Monday afternoon, Sept. 29, 1561, in the home of the King of Navarre. The provisional statement agreed on by the four came under discussion. It was brief, but its language was ambiguous. Martyr took exception to a confessional statement in which zeal for union clearly displaced the more timely virtue of theological veracity and accuracy.⁹⁸ "For my part," he said, when asked if he would

I. 537, 540. Schmidt's *Leben*, p. 262, which notes that Catherine's appointment of the smaller committee was first a suggestion made to her by Coligny. Gallasius, one of the five Protestants, writing from St. Germain to the Bishop of London, Sept. 29 and Oct. 6, 1561, mentions them (Baum's *Beza*, II., App., pp. 82-83). This letter is given in full by Baum, II., App. 80-84. Beza, writing to Calvin, Oct. 3-4, names the Ten, and says they had met *twice*, which Baum, quoting from Martyr's letter of Oct. 6th to the Zurich Senate (he does not have this letter in his collection), explains by saying that Martyr counts the preliminary session of Sept. 29th, at which Beza was not present, but in which nothing was decided (Baum's *Beza*, II., App. p. 93, note 3). These names are worked into some interesting poetry of the day which the Colloquy inspired. See, e.g., De Ruble, pp. 10, 49-56; Schmidt's *Leben*, p. 267, note.

⁹⁸ For this "confession," see Klipffel, p. 124, and Schmidt's *Leben*, p. 263. Cf. De Ruble, pp. 40-41. Baum, after stating that the Evangelicals were not pleased with the cutting down of the representatives to ten, says Martyr's whole position was discordant, and that he was thoroughly dissatisfied with the whole method of treatment (*Beza*, pp. 386-387). Eugen Lachenmann, in article on "Poissy" in PRE,³ p. 503, notes that Martyr was not satisfied with the confession, and passed as harsh and tenacious ("als hart und zähe galt"). Klipffel, p. 124, citing from Martyr's letter to the Zurich Senate, Oct. 6, says Martyr called this confession an "interim," as it was neither Protestant nor Romanist. Cf. Baum, *Beza*, II., Ap. p. 94, note 5. In a letter to Calvin, Oct. 4, 1561, Martyr says: "They who are at the head of affairs appear to be planning a certain *Interim*, and wish to effect a religion both Papistical and Lutheran" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1141; Eng. Trans., p. 156). He again refers to this *Interim* in a letter (Oct. 6) to the preacher Wolfgang Haller, but did not believe any good would come of it. See Schmidt's *Leben*, pp. 268-269, and Hottinger's *Hist. Eccl.*, VII. 754, referred to there.

approve the statement, "I answer, that the body of Christ is truly and substantially present nowhere else than in heaven. Nevertheless, I do not deny that Christ's true body and His true blood, which were given on the cross for the salvation of men, are through faith and spiritually received by believers at the holy supper."⁹⁹ The rock of offence in this utterance was the phrase "for my part" (*pro mea parte*). Seemingly, it left a suspicion that this was Martyr's personal view, and that the Reformed confrères were not of one mind, and Martyr and Beza being the leaders, it was easy to imagine a clash between them on a point out of which much capital could be made by the enemy. Overemphasis on this circumstance as an unpardonable evil, however, as well as excessive regret for it, is probably due more to interlinear reading and poetic license than to strict historic justice.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ For the Latin original, as given by D'Espence, see De Ruble's account, p. 40. Also Baird: *Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 540. Schmidt, *Leben*, p. 265.

¹⁰⁰ Particularly Professor Baum, in his invaluable *Theodor Beza*, II, pp. 391-392, who calls him "the already discordant Martyr who feared a repetition of the Worms affair," and whose action was "certainly not without the astonishment of his colleagues." Baum continues: "But Martyr's whole conduct, and particularly the clearly offensive expression, 'for my part,' did not escape the opponents, and especially d'Espence, and none failed to conclude from it that the Preachers, like the Prelates, were not one in their belief" (p. 392). The problem for the evangelicals now was to hit upon a form that would also satisfy Martyr! Baum says of Martyr (p. 394) that "before him Bullinger's finger, upraised in warning, ever hovered," and that on account of his "outwardly gentle tenacity" Martyr had to bear "the not indistinct reproach" on the part of the Catholic delegates that it was his unwillingness that had kept agreement from being swifter and easier. Schlosser (*Leben des Theodor de Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermili*, pp. 468-469) also calls attention to Bullinger's uneasiness over the Augsburg Confession, expressed in every letter, which, he says, made it "a difficult matter" (*ein schweres Geschäft*) for Martyr, who accordingly was forced to weigh the words of the formula more than he might otherwise have done. Schmidt, *Leben*, pp. 263-265, says Beza would surely not take the responsibility, and in Martyr's presence, of advancing in the name of the Reformed a confession with a double meaning. Schmidt says further (p. 265) that Martyr would not let himself be misled, that his

It must not be forgotten that Martyr held a unique position among writers on this subject. No one had gone into it with more persistent penetration than he. At Oxford he had his celebrated controversy with Stephen Gardiner and both there and in Strassburg, as Professor Schmidt notes, he has grounded the subject most profoundly and accurately. It was to be expected, therefore, that Martyr would take an important part in the narrowing definitions of the debate.¹⁰¹ Whatever was in the minds of those who had invited him, Martyr went to the Colloquy of Poissy to represent the side of Reformed evangelical truth, and when the time came, he gallantly declined to misrepresent it. Nowhere does this frank evangelicalism appear so well as in his confession which he read to the Committee of Ten at their meeting on September 30, 1561, in the home of the Bishop of Séz. It bears the title: *Sentiment of Dr. Peter Martyr Vermilius concerning the Presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, Proposed by him at the Colloquy held at Poissy*. So important is this document, that we give it in full.

"REVEREND Prelates and most learned men: When it seemed that an agreement had almost been reached in regard to the presence of the body of Christ in the administration of the Supper, I declared to you yesterday what my belief and opinion was respecting that doctrine. And as I then expressed it to you verbally, so I have now decided to restate it in writing, in order that I may make it more certain and clear to you. Accordingly, I hold that the real and substantial body of Christ is only in heaven, but the faithful, in communing, spiritually through faith truly receive his true body and true blood given up for us upon the cross. Wherefore, in the bread and wine of the Supper, I by no means approve of a transubstantiation and colleagues gave their assent to his words, and that he (Martyr) had not supposed his words would be so construed, but that, when he found it out, he read his confession the following day.

¹⁰¹ Hubert Languet had even named Martyr as the only theologian fitted for this business, because of his foresight and knowledge of court-life (Baum, II, 381, puts a question-mark here), but feared that finally Martyr would regret having come to Poissy.

consubstantiation. Furthermore, I maintain that local distance does not prevent our union with the body and blood of Christ, because the Lord's Supper is an heavenly thing, and while with the mouth of the body we on earth receive bread and wine, sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, yet, by faith and with the help of the Holy Spirit, our minds, to which this spiritual and heavenly food primarily belongs, being carried up to heaven, enjoy the present body and blood of Christ. And so I assert that there is no need of proving the body of Christ to be truly, substantially, and corporally present, either to us or in the symbols, by an illocal presence.

"Moreover, I say that the things signified are in no other way united to the external symbols than sacramentally, because by these [signs] they are represented, not profanely and lightly, but efficaciously through the institution of the Lord.

"This is the sum of my faith which I follow in this doctrine. Hence the formulated agreements that have been presented I accept in the sense in which they are referred, or may be accommodated, to the sense now set forth. If any one misconstrues or interprets in a contrary sense, I profess that I differ from him. And since, in these discussions, mention has been made of the substance of the body of Christ, by that name or word I understand nothing else than the true body of Christ. For our faith is not directed to a fictitious thing or phantom, but to the true, human and natural body which the Word of God received from the blessed Virgin, and gave for us on the cross. Wherefore, there is no reason why by that term [substance] we should be thought to hold that his real presence is anywhere else than in heaven.

"I, Peter Martyr Vermilius, a Florentine, have written these things with mine own hand, and with mine own mouth I have declared them before the reverend masters participating in this Colloquy."¹⁰²

¹⁰² The Latin original, a single paragraph, is found in the *Loci Communes*, Heidelberg edition, 1603, pp. 1070-1071. Also in Baum's *Theodor Beza*, II, Appendix, pp. 84-85, where it is dated 30. Sept. 1561, and registered: "Collect. Simler. Ex autog." Marten's English translation of the *Loc. Com.* has it, p. 141. Both Schlosser (pp. 469-471) and Schmidt (pp. 265-266) give it. Baird (*Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 540, note 1) merely refers to it. Martyr himself makes no reference in

For several reasons this statement is of rich significance. It not only marks the climax of Martyr's part in the Poissy Conference, but it also shows him on substantially Calvinistic ground in his view of the Eucharist.¹⁰³ It is the succinct yet comprehensive expression of a theologian who knew very definitely what he believed, and who wished to speak in such a way as to prevent all possible ambiguity.

The Committee of Ten continued in a discussion, mostly as to certain terms used, and a more detailed form was evolved which, while finally accepted by D'Espence, was not agreeable to the prelates, and at another sitting of the Committee on October 1st, a second and final confession was drawn up. True, even this formula did not altogether satisfy Martyr; but, as his biographer, Professor Schmidt, says, he accepted it so as to clear himself of the objection already made against him, that on account of his tenacity he was hindering every attempt at union.¹⁰⁴ At the same

his epistles to this confessional statement. But Simler, in his *Oratio* (p. 14) says Martyr set forth "a brief autograph of his view" (*breve chirographum suae sententiae*) which, acceptable to his colleagues, did not satisfy the Bishops, who thought it "too meagre" (*nimis jejunam*). With this confession compare also Martyr's confession on the Supper, given to the Strassburg Senate in 1556, and the statement to the Strassburg University, in 1553, of his relation to the Augsburg Confession (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1068-1070). Cf. above, notes 4 and 5.

¹⁰³ Professor Albert Frederick Pollard, of the University of London, writing the article on Martyr in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, 1911, Vol. 27, p. 1025, says Martyr's views "approximated most nearly to those of Martin Bucer." Dr. A. Edward Harvey, *Martin Bucer in England*, Marburg, 1906, pp. 33, 53-54, 101, sees Bucer's influence on both Martyr and Calvin in the eucharistic controversy. But the idea of the mind of the communicant being carried up to the risen humanity of Christ, and feeding on that, thus being a pledge of the Resurrection, is Calvin's own view, and is one of the vital points in which Martyr coincides with Calvin. For another epistolary statement of Martyr's view, see also his letter from Zurich, May 25, 1562, written to "A Certain Friend, an eloquent and famous man, concerning the cause of the Eucharist" (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1144-1146; Eng. Tr., pp. 161-164). This friend was John Sturm (Baum, *Beza*, II. Ap. pp. 185-189, where the letter is also given, and listed among the MSS. from the Protestant Seminary at Strassburg).

¹⁰⁴ Schmidt, *Leben*, p. 266. For these confessions, cf. DeRuble, pp.

time he hastened to write the next day (Oct. 2nd) a note of assurance to the anxious Bullinger. "My colleagues," he says, in this rare and exceedingly significant expression, "appear to me to yield too much (*aliquid remittere*), but nevertheless they maintain that the bread and wine are not in reality (*reipsa*) the body and blood of Christ, and that the partaking (*perceptionem*) of the things signified is spiritual and occurs through faith. But they are compelled to make use of the word 'substance' (*vocabulum substantiae*) because they use it in their Catechism and in the Confession which they presented to the King before my arrival. We are still in this same deliberation, and nothing conclusive has yet been decided. *I appear severe (durus), so that some of the commissioners say that it is on account of me that they do not come to an agreement.* And I doubt not but that this is also the reason why I am less acceptable (*minus gratum*) to the Queen Mother and the other nobles, as these desire to effect an agreement between us by all methods as quickly as possible. For the more the settlement of the religious question is deferred, the more they fear uprisings among the people."¹⁰⁵

40-42. Klipffel, pp. 124-125. Baird, I. 540, notes 2 and 3. Young's *Paleario*, I. 481-482. Baum's *Beza*, II. 393-394, note 11. Also in letter of Des Gallars to the Bishop of London, Oct. 6, 1561, in Baum, II. App., pp. 83-84. See also the last paragraph in letter of Condé to Zurich, dated Oct. 10, 1561, in which he says: "It is also certain that the king has given a new summons to the bishops and priests to oppose a confession of faith which the ministers and churches of France have delivered to the aforesaid *King of France*, who has sent for the aforesaid bishops and given them to understand that he will have it received in case they do not oppose it, and he has fixed for them a time to debate it" (*Baum*, II., App. p. 103).

¹⁰⁵ Baum gives the Latin of "this remarkable passage, as he calls it (*Beza*, II. 395, note 13), and notes that it is in the *original* of Martyr's letter (of Oct. 2, 1561) to Bullinger, but is left out of all the editions of Martyr's *Loci Communes* containing his *Letters*. This was done, says Baum, out of regard for Beza and the church at Geneva, and also in order not to furnish "the lurking opponents" with a weapon. The original passage is from the Simler Collection of Zurich MSS. In the midst of the Latin sentence about the word "substance" Baum inserts in German the somewhat needless intrusion: "for which there-

That an agreement of some kind had been reached by the ten men, was in itself a source of premature jubilation on both sides, especially with Catherine de' Medici. It was, however, as Professor Schmidt aptly calls it, "inconsequent toil and premature hope," because they reckoned without the prelates at Poissy, and in particular without the cardinals Lorraine and de Tournon. When Catherine sent to them the last "formula of Poissy," they scornfully rejected it (Oct. 4-6), and three days later (Oct. 9), having prescribed a counter formula embodying their own view, they anathematized those believing otherwise. This ultimatum practically ended the Colloquy so far as any mutual discussion on the one controverted point was concerned. In addition to this decree, they also drew up certain so-called "Canons," largely matters of discipline, which Martyr did not take seriously, although he feared trouble. Moreover, the prelates themselves were so inharmonious that in their session of October 10th, the cardinals and bishops almost came to blows.¹⁰⁶ To the influence of the Cardinal

fore I [Martyr] am not to blame, he will give his 'rigid companion' [Bullinger] to understand." This special section of this letter is also given in Schmidt's *Leben*, p. 267, without mention of its usual omission. The italics are ours. The confession referred to is the Gallican Confession of 1559, which Beza had presented to King Charles IX. at the first session of the Colloquy of Poissy. See note 28 above. The clause alluded to is "de la substance de son corps et de son sang" in Art. 36 (See E. F. Karl Müller: *Die Bekenntnisschriften der ref. Kirche*, p. 230; and Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, II. 380).

¹⁰⁶ Martyr to Bullinger, Oct. 17, 1561 (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1141; Eng. Tr., p. 157). Martyr says here that he saw some of these Canons "four days ago" (Oct. 13), "which are so rude and coarse that you may thereby easily understand that the bondslaves of the Pope do not desire any reformation of the Church." Professing to correct some unimportant things, they retain the mass, sacramental confession, authority of the Pope, images, and pilgrimages. "Nor do I doubt but that I shall hear of far coarser things." In his letter of the same date (Oct. 17) to the Zurich Senate, Martyr says that "by the wondrous providence of God it happened that suddenly among the bishops who were at Poissy such a grave disagreement arose that they almost came to blows, and, more than that, as men worthy of credence affirm, the matter descended to fists and nails (*pugnis et unguibus*), but afterward

of Ferrara, the papal legate, Martyr attributed much of the trouble and the final ultimatum on the whole subject. He notes that the five Roman Catholic collocutors were accused of heresy because of their seeming agreement with the five Reformed collocutors on the subject of the Sacrament. "Wherefore," he continues, "they would not let them for their side confer with us any more. For which cause the Colloquy has now been suspended fifteen days, and I very much fear lest it be broken off altogether. You cannot believe in how many ways and by how many artifices the papists have most craftily procured this thing, namely, that the disputation begun should not proceed. Which attempt of theirs the authority and will of the legate, that is, the Cardinal of Ferrara, has much helped."¹⁰⁷ And further on in the same letter: "Cardinal Ferrara, the ambassador, has certainly disquieted all things; yet, as we trust, he is not more powerful than Christ."

Turning for the moment from the severely dogmatic

it was quieted down, and the Conference having been given up (*omisso colloquio*), they devoted themselves to beating out (*cutendos*) certain Canons which they determined to present to the Queen and royal assembly for confirmation. A part of these has come into my hands. If the rest of them are not unlike these, it will not be difficult to confute them. But since the end of such a great controversy is so far off, seditions and even grave things are to be feared, and possibly bloodshed" (Baum, *Beza*, II., Appendix, p. 107. Cf. Baird: *Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 542, note 2). Beza apparently had no such fears. See his letter of Oct. 3-4, 1561, to Calvin, in Baum, as cited, p. 95, note 8.

¹⁰⁷ Epistle to Bullinger, Oct. 17, 1561. In his letter of the same date to the Zurich Senate, after speaking of the edict of Oct. 18, in reference to the restitution of the churches, Martyr adds: "Some hope of concord had appeared, but the papal legate, i.e. Cardinal Ferrara disturbed all things. The incredible power of the adversaries has also increased. The more doubtful things are, the more we implore the help of your prayers." (Baum: *Beza*, II., App., p. 108). In this letter (p. 105) he says the Colloquy has been suspended for *sixteen* days. Simler observes in his *Oratio* that by their own means the Colloquy was suspended "for certain days," and finally by their own will and "by instigation of the papal legate," it was broken off altogether. Writing to Calvin, Oct. 4, 1561, Martyr also spoke of the five Roman Catholic collocutors as accused of heresy by their own colleagues (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1141; Eng. Tr., p. 156).

side of the Colloquy of Poissy, Martyr speaks of the remarkable increase in the number of the Reformed. On October 12, 1561, he says some of them went out from Paris to hear a sermon in a field, as they had no church, and there were eight thousand present. This act of religious liberty was resented by the papists, who tried to shut the walls of Paris against them. They forced an entrance, however, and in the ensuing encounter both sides had wounded and slain. As this was a general condition in France, Martyr felt that stern necessity would drive the Queen and the Royal Council to grant the Huguenots public meetings and some churches. "Otherwise," said he, "there will be no end of scandals and conflicts." In some sections of France the Huguenots had taken possession of the churches without royal consent. Catherine took great offence at this. The papists demanded restitution. The Protestants protested. Martyr feared further bloodshed. "As I write these things," he tells Bullinger, "the princes are now in counsel to discern what shall be deemed best in regard to this matter. . . . But how much we are to obtain, I do not know. If by an edict the people are commanded to restore the temples, both seditions and slaughter are to be feared."¹⁰⁸ This decree, known as the "Edict of Restitution," was issued, and by it the Huguenots were required to restore the churches they had seized. On the nineteenth of October, Martyr wrote to Ludwig Lavater in Zurich, telling him that on the evening of the seventeenth¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ Oct. 17, 1561 (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1141-1142). In the corresponding letter to the Zurich Senate (Baum, II. App., pp. 107-108). Martyr also speaks of the increasing numbers of Huguenots, the Paris encounter of Oct. 12th, and the Edict of Restitution.

¹⁰⁹ "XVII. huius mensis ad vesperam decretum factum est à Regiis consilariis" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1142). Writing of this Edict to the Senate of Zurich on Oct. 17 (Baum, II. 107), Martyr says: "unde videntur hodie facturi esse Decretum, ut restituantur Tempia occupata." It was doubtless executed on the eighteenth. Cf. De Ruble: *Le Colloque de Poissy*, p. 49. See also Baird: *Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 544, note 2; and Baum's *Beza*, II. 409, note 17. "If this happens," continues Martyr, meaning if the Edict is passed and executed, "there is im-

the King's decree was made, indulging therewith the hope that the Huguenots would be granted public assemblies and assigned definite places. "But," he added, "whether this is to be, I do not know. For the power of the ecclesiasticals is incredible." In a subsequent letter to Bullinger, Martyr states that the churches in Aquitania had restored the temples, and were given places for worship. This same edict, he says, prohibited armor, the hurling of stones, use of the epithets "Papists" and "Huguenots," mutual abuse for the sake of religion, breaking into houses; and still other provisions; viz., not over 300 to 500 allowed to assemble at any one service, Protestant ministers to refrain from bitter attacks against the Pope and the Mass, and all armor and weapons to be taken from both sides.¹¹⁰ To help in the nation's debt, the Cardinals and Bishops bound themselves to pay 1,600,000 francs each year for a period of ten years.¹¹¹

minent danger, and indeed no light one, that it will come to arms, fights and slaughters, for the instigators (*concionatores*) will not be able to restrain the people. Nor will they [the people] be easily led to restore the images which they have demolished" (Baum, II. App., pp. 107-108. Cf. also p. 409, note 18). The civil strifes which soon followed proved Martyr's apprehensions far from groundless. Beza was so angered at the Edict of Restitution that he almost returned at once to Geneva. Baum calls this edict the chief cause of the civil wars (*Ibid.*, p. 409. Cf. pp. 408-413). Simler, *Oratio*, pp. 14-15, gives the main provisions of the Edict. Schmidt, *Leben*, p. 270, dates the Edict as Oct. 20th.

¹¹⁰ To Bullinger, Oct. 20, 1561 (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1142). In the English edition (p. 159) this letter is wrongly dated Oct. 2nd, doubtless another typist's error.

¹¹¹ So Martyr says in his letter to Bullinger, Oct. 20. His words are: "Obstrinxerunt se ad persolvendum Regi usque *ad decennium*, in singulum quenque annum *sedecies centena millia Francorum* (ut dicitur) ad relevandum regnum aere alieno" (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1142-1143). According to Beza, in his letter of Oct. 21 and 23, 1561, to Calvin, it was *sixteen million franks* (*sedecim milliones frankorum*) with interest, and to be paid in six years (*intra sex annos*): and this sum is quoted by Carol. Joinvillaeus in his letter to Rod. Gualther, Nov. 5, 1561 (Baum's *Beza*, II. App. pp. 109, 123). Martyr may have been misinformed as to the exact figures. In any event, the mere fact

Returning to the Colloquy, all circumstances now pointed to the fact that Martyr's part in it had come to an end. In fact, the Colloquy itself was dissolved on October 19th, and the prelates and others were leaving.¹¹² In addition, there is reason to believe that Martyr was losing prestige with the Queen. He was summoned to her only very seldom and privately, and finally even these rare calls for him ceased altogether.¹¹³ She had been so anxious for him to

that the clergy had such sums with which to help finance the kingdom, is food for pious reflection. Klipffel, *Le Colloque de Poissy*, pp. 149-155, dwells on it.

¹¹² "To-day the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise departed from the Court, and the assembly of the Prelates held at Poissy is dissolved. Wherefore the cardinals and bishops are also leaving here. But before they went away they condemned the Confession of the French churches. As for the Colloquy which was begun, it is utterly broken off, because the Prelates did not wish to have it continued, avoiding a meeting with us and sight of us. And since there is nothing to do here, we seek our dismissal, which as yet we have not obtained" (Martyr to Lewis Lavater, Oct. 19, 1561). As early as Oct. 4th, Martyr wrote Calvin of a report that the Bishops were determined to leave Poissy the next week (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1141). On Oct. 17, 1561, Martyr wrote to the Zurich Senate: "I fear (although I cannot know certainly) that the Colloquy has already been broken off, not at all through fault (culpa) of ours, but by the sin (vitio) of our adversaries. For it has been suspended 16 days." Near the close of this letter, speaking of the canons and Edict of Restitution, he says: "And then at length we shall know whether the colloquy begun is to go forward" (Baum, *Beza*, II. App. pp. 106, 108. Cf. note 107 above). Yet in his letter to Bullinger, of the same date (Oct. 17), speaking of Cardinal Châtillon leaving Poissy, Martyr adds in parenthesis: "For the assembly of the Prelates is dissolved" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1142). Three days later (Oct. 20) he wrote to Bullinger: "The Cardinals and Bishops have dissolved their Synod" (*Ibid.*, p. 1142). "The Colloquy having been broken off, and since nothing can be done here, we petition for dismissal. It is not yet obtained, but it will be given shortly" (p. 1143). In this same letter he says: "While I was writing these things, three of our colleagues went away" (p. 1143). Simler, in his *Oratio*, p. 14, notes that the Cardinals of the houses of Guise and many Bishops departed on Oct. 19th. See also Baird's *Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 544, note 5.

¹¹³ On Oct. 2nd he wrote to Bullinger: "I am called rarely to the Queen, and that in private. It is not obscure by whose pains this is done. But I will explain this to you at another time" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1140). Who this unnamed person was, is a matter of fruitless con-

come, had expected such great things from him, but these fond hopes had now completely vanished. Furthermore, reports had it that both she and the King of Navarre were under great fear, caused by threatening letters from Philip II. of Spain, forbidding any infringement of Roman authority in France. The same rumor added that, by command of the King, the already-departed bishops were to return to Poissy and there confute the confession of the French churches.¹¹⁴

Still another fruitless phase of the whole problem was the arrival at Paris and St. Germain, on the very day (Oct. 19) on which the Colloquy broke up, of five German

jecture. In his letter of Oct. 4th, to Calvin, Martyr writes: "I, after I had given counsel for the pure and sincere restoration of religion, am no more summoned [to the Queen]. Nor does she demand from me any counsel or instruction" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1141). Explaining to Bullinger, in the letter of Oct. 17, why he has not spoken [recently] to the Queen about religious affairs, Martyr replies: "We have no access to her except when she calls. But she does not summon us now. It remains to deal with her by supplications" (*Ibid.*, p. 1142). Schmidt, *Leben*, p. 268, says Catherine could have wished Martyr more flexible (biegsamer) and diplomatic; also that by his opponents, to whom he appeared as the most dangerous because the most learned defender of Protestantism, he was calumniated as a "mischief-maker" (Unruhstifter). They claimed that as a foreigner he could not be deeply concerned for the peace of France. Of course, the answer to such cavil is the fact that he came to the Colloquy, in spite of his age, the perils of the times, and his own feeling that little good would come of it. See above, on notes 24 and 37.

¹¹⁴ "They say that the Queen Mother and the King of Navarre are powerfully terrified by King Philip from all change in ecclesiastical matters" (Martyr to Bullinger, Oct. 17, 1561; *Loc. Com.*, p. 1142). After his return to Zurich, in a letter of Nov. 25, 1561, Martyr mentions this report to Beza, who was still at Poissy, but refuses to give these rumors full credit until he receives confirmatory word from Beza. On the same day (Nov. 25) Martyr wrote to Calvin of these things, and added that it would be a plain deceit (fraus), one side being dismissed, to call in the adversaries for the purpose of condemning those not present (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1143-1144. In the Latin edition the epistle to Calvin precedes that to Beza; in the Eng. ed., pp. 160-161, this order is reversed). Klipffel calls Philip II. "le roi de l'inquisition," and "the real chief of Catholicism in Europe at that time" (*Le Colloque de Poissy*, pp. 170-171).

theologians. Three of them came as representatives from Duke Christoph of Würtemberg; namely, Jacob Andreae, of Göppingen; Jacob Beuerlin, of Tübingen; and Balthasar Bidembach, of Stuttgart. In Paris they were joined by the other two, Peter Bouquin and Michael Diller, sent by the Elector of the Palatinate.¹¹⁵ They left, without accomplishing anything, on November 24th, after one of their number, Beuerlin, died of the Plague, which had been raging in Paris since the beginning of August.¹¹⁶ Their visit has been regarded by some historians as a scheme of Cardinal Lorraine's to bring confusion into the Colloquy by setting the German Lutherans against the French and Swiss Calvinists.¹¹⁷ They arrived "too late to do any

¹¹⁵ See Baum: *Theodor Beza*, II., pp. 369-371, 419-429. Baird: *Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 544-545. Heinrich Heppe: *Theodor Beza* (Elberfeld, 1861), pp. 150-152. Beza wrote to Calvin, Oct. 23, 1561: "I have just now heard that certain theologians have come from Palatine and Würtemberg. It is well that they arrived so late" (Baum, *Beza*, II. App., p. 112). See Baum, p. 428, note 13, and the Beilagen, p. 119. On Nov. 5, 1561, Carol Joinvillaeus wrote to Rod. Gualther: "Praeterea Lutetiam advenisse quinque Theologos Germanos a *Palatino* et *Wirtembergico* missos, inter quos est *Dillerus* ille, totus noster, et *Bocquinius*." (Ibid., p. 124). See also de Ruble: *Le Colloque de Poissy*, pp. 46-49. They are also named in the article in PRE,³ Vol. 15 (1904), p. 504.

¹¹⁶ "Yesterday," writes Beza to Calvin, Nov. 25th, "the German theologians departed. Absolutely nothing was accomplished with them" (Baum, *Beza*, II. App., p. 135). In his letter to Calvin, Nov. 4th, Beza says: "Burlin, one of the Würtemberg delegates, died of the Plague at Paris," and Beza adds that he does not know where the others are, and is not likely to find out. Beuerlin died, Oct. 28th. Of the Plague, Beza says (to Calvin, Oct. 23): "The Plague is beginning to rage here," i.e., in St. Germain (Baum, as above, pp. 122, 112). See Schmidt's *Leben*, p. 270. Also Baum, II. 422-423.

¹¹⁷ Baum (see note 115, above) takes this view. Also DeRuble (*Op. cit.* pp. 46-47) and Klipffel (pp. 131-132, 185-187), who says one does not know which to admire more, the naive candor of the good German (Duke Christoph) or the hypocritical impudence of Lorraine (p. 186). Baird (*Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 545, note 2), based on Soldan's *Geschichte des Prot. in Frankreich*, does not attribute the Germans' visit to Lorraine, but rather to the King of Navarre. Cf. Heppe's *Beza*, p. 151, note. According to Martyr, Cardinal Lorraine and the Duke of Guise left St. Germain on Oct. 19th (Letter to

harm," as Professor Baird puts it; and, whereas Beza speaks of them in his letters to Calvin, Martyr's epistles contain no reference to them at all.¹¹⁸

Passing notice should here be made of Martyr's change of residence. Along with others, he had dwelt at St. Germain in the residence of the Cardinal of Châtillon, who, during the sessions of the Colloquy, had moved to Poissy. On October 16th, however, the Cardinal returned to his house at the Court, and Martyr and his colleagues were sent to the lodging of Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara, who had returned to the French Court after the death (in 1559) of her husband, Duke Hercules of Este. The pious Renata, an aunt of Catherine de' Medici, and ever a hospitable friend to Protestant refugees, the good friend of Calvin and Clement Marot, had given shelter to Martyr nineteen years before (1542) in his flight from Lucca to Zurich. Her private chaplain was François de Morel, who was one of the original twelve Reformed ministers at the Colloquy of Poissy. She followed the deliberations of the Colloquy with "lively interest," and having heard that Beza and Martyr were to be present, she expressed a desire to see them. Unfortunately, though Martyr was her guest for his last two weeks at St. Germain, nothing is recorded of any interviews between him and her. In his letter to

Lavater, Oct. 19; *Loc. Com.*, p. 1142, Eng. Tr., p. 158). See note 112 above.

¹¹⁸ The nearest Martyr gets to German influence at this time, is a passage in a letter, written two days before the Würtembergers arrived, in which he allays Bullinger's fears of the *Augustana*: "In regard to the Augsburg Confession, I implore you not to fret yourself, for the ecclesiastics will not receive it, because they are not willing to have any of their affairs changed. Likewise our churches will not accept it, since they have decreed to follow their own French Confession. In like manner, all our collocutors do not want it. Calvin also especially dissuades from doing it. Hence I do not see that any danger will come from this" (To Bullinger, Oct. 17, 1561; *Loc. Com.*, p. 1142). See above, notes 4, 77-79, 100. De Ruble says that Peter Martyr and Nicolas des Gallars left France without entering into conference with the German theologians, and Beza was left to cope with them alone (*Le Colloque de Poissy*, p. 48).

Bullinger, Oct. 17, 1561, he makes the following reference to it: "Yesterday we changed our lodging, for the Cardinal Châtillon returned to the court, and since he is not to remain at Poissy any longer (for the conference of the Prelates is dissolved), he returned to his own dwelling where we were staying. Wherefore, by the command of the Queen, we were removed to the lodging of the Duchess of Ferrara, because she knew, as she testified, that such guests would not be unwelcome to that Princess."¹¹⁹

Everything now pointed to Martyr's return to Zurich. Of the Reformed visitors, Bezà and Des Gallars alone remained. Catherine, with her ever-hopeful diplomacy, prevailed on Bezà to tarry longer for the discussion of certain questions, and she might have urged Martyr to keep him company. But he wanted to go. The place was no longer congenial to him. He could not be idle in a place where his services were no longer of any use. Sickly and weary, with a long journey and the on-coming winter before him, there was nothing for him to do but ask for a gracious dismissal.¹²⁰ For this purpose he went to the Prince of Condé, by whom he was conducted to the Queen Mother.

¹¹⁹ *Loc. Com.*, p. 1142; Eng. Tr., p. 158. See also Schmidt's *Leben*, p. 270. On his first reception by Renata at Ferrara, cf. the same, pp. 43-44. Neither Simler nor Schlosser mentions Martyr's change of lodging at the Colloquy. See also text and notes 50 and 23 above.

¹²⁰ "Er war kränklich und der Sache herzlich müde," says Baum (*Beza*, II. 416). Schmidt notes that he was anxious to get away from soil "so little favorable to the Reformation" (*Leben*, p. 270). Josiah Simler adds: "Therefore when Martyr saw that he could do nothing more here, especially as he had little use of the French language, he resolved to ask for permission to depart" (*Oratio*, p. 15). Martyr himself, on Oct. 17, 1561, wrote to Bullinger: "If the hope of the Colloquy be cut off this week, as I suspect it will, I shall ask leave to depart the next week. For it is not proper that I should make such poor use of good leisure." On Oct. 19th he wrote to Ludwig Lavater: "And since there is nothing here for us to do, we seek permission to leave, which we have not yet obtained." Again to Bullinger, Oct. 20th: "The Colloquy having been broken off, and since nothing can be done here, we ask for dismissal. It is not yet obtained, but it will be given shortly" (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1141, 1142, 1143; Eng. Ed., pp. 157, 158, 159).

Here we have Martyr's final audience with Catherine de' Medici. His last words to her reflect the same learning and loyalty, the same courage and courtesy that she must have observed in all his previous interviews with her. In substance he said: We are bound to render unto God what is God's, and to Princes what belongs to Princes; and for this reason he had come hither to further the cause of religion and obey her Majesty, which he was all the more willing to do because all men spoke honorably of her excellent virtues, because her kingdom was most notable, and they were both natives of the same country, but pre-eminently because he wished to obey the Zurich magistracy, which thought well of the King and Queen of France, a matter of no small moment, considering the influential standing of Zurich in the Swiss Confederacy. As to the Colloquy, he had omitted nothing which he thought would serve its purpose. He had dealt peacefully, as she had bidden him. That it had not turned out better, was not his fault; although the future would show that it was not altogether useless. But as nothing more could be done now, he asked leave to depart, being an old man, and the winter close at hand, when the journey home would be rendered burdensome by rain, snow, and the short days. Besides, he had heard that it had been reported to her that he, a foreigner, had come hither for no other purpose than to stir up trouble in the kingdom, that he took pleasure in such evils. He besought her not to be hasty in believing such things (*ne facilit talia de se crederet*), as he was a man utterly foreign to such crimes (*homo ab ijs flagitijs prorsus alienus*). He had been in Strassburg, then in England, then again in Strassburg, and finally in Switzerland. From these places she might be informed, if she did not believe him, that he had always sought peace and concord, so far as it could come through the Word of God (*quantum per verbum Dei fieri posset*). Indeed, nothing could incite him against the French kingdom, to which he had been most

friendly, as were his ancestors; and even more so to the Queen, since she was of his own country, as it were, its light and splendor, for which reason he was so disposed toward her that, if the exigency demanded, he would willingly give his life for her honor and safty. Among other things which he chiefly desired was, that she, with her children and the kingdom of France, might be preserved. This being so, he asked that she would dismiss him, not in disgrace, but in good favor.¹²¹

To this address Catherine replied graciously, thanking Martyr that he had come,¹²² and promising him safe and sure departure within two days (*idque intra bidum*). She also besought him that, if his services were needed again for the same cause, he would not refuse to undertake the journey again. The task, she knew, was great, yet she regarded it useful and necessary. As to the accusations of others, she said she had heard many things, but had always reserved judgment to herself, and she testified that she had ever thought well of him (*se omnino bene de ipso existimare*). Martyr thanked her, and entered a plea for the afflicted churches, defending their confiscation of the "temples" on the ground that when the King demanded restoration of the same, they obeyed. He added that if occasionally (*interdum*) outrages were committed by the ruder and weaker element, this should not be imputed to Protestant teaching. Thereupon he was dismissed by Catherine, and afterward bidden formal farewell by the Queen

¹²¹ From Simler's *Oratio*, p. 15. Schmidt gives it in quotation form (*Leben*, pp. 270-271). The summary of this address is also in F. C. Schlosser's *Leben des Theodor de Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermili*, pp. 473-475, and in M. Young, *The Life and Times of Aonio Paleario*, I. 483-484. Neither Schmidt, Schlosser, nor Young, notes the historical source.

¹²² Strangely enough, Anthonie Marten, in his English translation of Simler's *Oratio*, has altogether omitted rendering of the words "gratias illi egit quod venisset." Baum says Catherine spoke with "the ambiguous volubility peculiar to her" (*Beza*, II. 416).

of Navarre, the King, the Prince of Condé, and Admiral Coligni.¹²³

Conformably to the law and etiquette of the time, Martyr took with him to Zurich important documents which were both protective and commendatory. Besides the usual safe-conduct, special letters were written to Zurich by King Anthony of Navarre, Admiral Coligni, and the Prince of Condé.¹²⁴ The royal passport, given by King Charles, at St. Germain, October 25, 1561, extended for two months the protection and privileges of the former one, of July 30th, which was good for four months. It drew attention to Martyr's advanced age and the personal inconvenience of a belated departure.¹²⁵

Catherine's letter to the Zurich Senate is characteristic. We give it in full.¹²⁶

"To the Noble Lords, our dear and special friends, allies and confederates, the Burgomasters and Council of the city of *Zurich*.

¹²³ Simler's *Oratio*, p. 15. Cf. note 121 above.

¹²⁴ On Nov. 25, 1561, Martyr wrote from Zurich to Calvin: "Besides, the Queen Mother and the King of Navarre have written hither very courteous letters; likewise the Princes, the Admiral and Condé, which letters were most welcome" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1143; Eng. Trans., p. 160). Simler, in his *Oratio*, p. 15, also says: "Moreover, the Queen Mother and all the princes just now named [Navarre, Condé, Coligni, et al.], by letters to the Senate of Zurich, thanked them for sending Martyr to the Colloquy, as they had requested of them; and at the same time they honored Martyr with merited praises."

¹²⁵ "Desquelz quatre mois ne restant plus a expirer que le prochain [November] dans lequel pour l'ancienneté de son aage il ne pourroit bonnement sortir et estre hors sans grande incommodité de sa personne" (Baum's *Beza*, II, *Beilagen* pp. 114-115). This second passport, though longer, is in practically the same form and language as the first (See above, note 40). At its close, after "the year of grace" 1561, it adds: "And of our reign the first," and the secretary subscribing the second is "Robertet"; in the first one it is "De l'Aubespine." Both are Zurich MSS.: the first, in Baum's reprint, comprising thirty lines of old French; the second, forty-three lines.

¹²⁶ Baum's *Beza*, II, App., 115-116. On the seal are the words: "Catherine par la grace de Dieu royne de France." Schmidt also gives this letter, in German translation, in his *Leben*, pp. 271-272. He calls it "ein schönes Zeugniß für ihn."

"Noble Lords, our dear friends, allies and confederates.

"In returning to you *Doctor Martyr*, your townsman, bearer of this letter, we wish to send with him the present writing to testify to you that in the religious discussions which have been carried on here he conducted himself so modestly and virtuously that we have every reason to remember him with praise and satisfaction, and to thank you, as indeed we most heartily do, for permitting him to come here. We are, however, sorely grieved that the Colloquy with its conference did not bear the fruit which we would desire, and which is so necessary for the union of the whole Christian Church in one holy and Catholic religion. But, this being a favor which one must expect and hope from the infinite goodness of God, who alone rules such things, we beseech Him to grant and bestow it upon us as soon as His wisdom deems it to be necessary for us. We also pray that He will keep you, most noble Lords, in His holy and deserving protection. Given at St. Germain en Laye, the 28 day of October, 1561.

"*Catherine.*

"Bourdin."

The letter of Antoine de Bourbon, King of Navarre, was not unlike Catherine's. "We are returning to you," it began, "your venerable and learned *Peter Martyr*," assured them that for "the merit of his great virtues with which he is distinguished," and in consideration of the recommendation he had brought from them, they had sought to guarantee to him "all proper protection and honorable treatment as was possible." And though all things had not succeeded as they had hoped for in sending for him, God evidently desiring religion to continue longer in controversy, yet they testified to Martyr's upright behaviour as what was to be expected from one of his reputation, which greatly satisfied the King, the Queen Mother, and the whole Council. It is dated from St. Germain en Laye, Oct. 29, 1561, and is signed: "The King of Navarre, Your great and good friend Anthony."¹²⁷

It is only with difficulty that one refrains from reading

¹²⁷ From the reprint of the old French original in Baum's *Beza*, II., Beilagen, p. 116.

between the lines in each of these documents. Both give the personal commendation that never could have been omitted because so richly deserved. But both also breathe definite disappointment, the primal cause of which is left to individual conjecture. Nor would it be a wholly unwarranted assumption to conclude, even from these two communications, that both Anthony and Catherine were profoundly disappointed in Martyr's abilities to reconcile the irreconcilable. This presumption is all the more likely when we recall the great hopes which Catherine set on Martyr at the beginning of the Colloquy.¹²⁸

A third letter written to Zurich was by Louis de Bourbon, the Prince of Condé, younger brother of Anthony, King of Navarre. It was also written from St. Germain, and though dated over two weeks earlier (Oct. 10th), it refers to the other communications from the palace. It also expresses appreciation of "*Monsieur Martyr*, whom you so generously sent here in order, with his great learning, to help clear up the doubts and differences with which our religion is today perturbed in this kingdom." It spoke, too, of Martyr's "honorable old age" and the failure of the Colloquy.¹²⁹

Thus protected and commended, Peter Martyr was ready to turn homeward; Francis Russel, Earl of Bedford, had sent him an urgent request to visit England while he was so near, an invitation Martyr could not accept.¹³⁰ Evi-

¹²⁸ See above, p. 425, (in Art. II.) and note 51.

¹²⁹ Also in Baum: *Beza*, II., App., pp. 101-103. This letter has an unsigned postscript, speaks also of the intrigues of the Guises, de Nemours, and King Philip of Spain; and the Protestant Confession. See note 104 above.

¹³⁰ "The Earl of Bedford wrote very lovingly to me from England and requested that, as I am very near, I should return home by way of England. This I was not willing to promise him because I shall want to return home as quickly as possible (*quantocyus*)."
(From Martyr's letter to Bullinger, Oct. 17, 1561, in *Loc. Com.*, p. 1142; Eng. Tr., p. 158). Schmidt, *Leben*, p. 272, note 3, referring to a letter of Randolph to Martyr, under date of Oct. 6, 1561, says that in England they generally expected to see Martyr.

dently Catherine was genuinely anxious to have his return-journey safe and pleasant in every way. "The Queen," he wrote to Bullinger, "is planning to send me back in the company and protection of Lady Roetelin, mother of the Prince of Longville, to whom belongs the town of Newburg [Neufchatel]. She is a very pious woman and desires to leave here in a few days. She [the Queen] will send with me some man in her own name, by whom I may the more safely reach home."¹³¹ However, as the marquise was to delay for some days, and Martyr was anxious to get home before the bad weather set in, he did not wait for her company. For the same reason he had to give up the idea of returning by way of Geneva and the consequent pleasure of a visit with Calvin.¹³² Hubert Languet, who held

¹³¹ Oct. 20, 1561 (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1143). On Nov. 4, 1561, Beza wrote to Calvin: "Our *Martyr* has at last departed, with an honorable company and under favorable conditions, and the journey, as I understand, is begun with the *marchioness Rotelin*." Beza had formerly written to Calvin, on Oct. 21, 1561: "Meanwhile all our colleagues have departed. And Peter Martyr will return within three days in honorable company, or will be entrusted to the *marchioness Rotelin* who, so they say, will return to you [an error? not Geneva, but Neufchatel?] in fifteen days. But they want me and Gallasius to remain a few days" (Baum: *Beza*, II., App., pp. 122, 110). Carol Joinvillaeus wrote to Rod. Gualther (Nov. 5, 1561), possibly referring to Beza's letter of Nov. 4th, and says of Martyr: "For Dr. *Beza* wrote that he would a little later return to you with honorable escort." This marquise was Jacqueline de Rohan, widow of Francis of Orleans, Margrave of Roetelin and lord of Neufchatel. She died in 1586, in the Reformed faith (Baum: *Beza*, II., App., p. 110, note 4; also p. 124). Schmidt, in his *Life of Martyr*, p. 272, calls her "a true Protestant," who had corresponded with Calvin and Farel. In the citation above from Beza's letter to Calvin, it is barely possible that Beza thought Martyr would return via Geneva. Baum's correction (p. 110, note 4) does not take this possibility into account.

¹³² Martyr to Calvin, Nov. 25, 1561: "I had hoped on my way back to visit you, but as the winter is here, I was afraid that, if I returned home by a longer route, I would be overtaken with rain or bad weather. For this cause also I was led not to join the company of the marquise of Roethling and the Prince of Longavil, as they most earnestly (*mirum in modum*) besought me when I was with them at Blandine. I refused to assent, because I perceived that the journey was to be deferred some days. Then I reflected that it would not

Martyr in such high esteem, would gladly have accompanied him as far as his own home in Burgundy, but he was compelled to remain behind in order to greet the newly-arrived Palatinate theologians.¹³³ The young Stuckius, Martyr's secretary, who had come with him, did not return to Zurich, but became a tutor in the family of a wealthy Parisian nobleman.¹³⁴ Terenziano returned with Martyr. Admiral Coligni and the Prince of Condé each gave him one of his captains as an escort,¹³⁵ and the King of Navarre

matter very much if we were deprived of bodily presence, since we have our minds and thoughts (*animos et sensus*) so very closely united (*quam conjunctissimos*). This was shown by the very steadfast harmony which we cultivated among us in France, as many as were appointed to the colloquy held there, when we lived together in the same house and at one table, whose peaceable and holy fellowship I shall never forget. Wherefore, I implore you, have me excused if I returned home by a shorter way" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1144; Eng. Tr., p. 161). This passing note is testimony to Martyr's esteem of Calvin, and also his sense of the Christian fellowship with his colleagues at the Colloquy. Cf. also Baum's *Beza*, II., Ap., p. 122, note 5.

¹³³ Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli*, p. 272.

¹³⁴ Martyr wrote to Bullinger, Oct. 20, 1561: "I think I have provided well for Stucki. He will be with a certain nobleman of Paris, who is both pious and rich. He shall instruct a young brother of his, and between times he shall be allowed to pursue his own studies, nor shall he lack anything." (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1143; Eng. Tr., p. 159).

¹³⁵ Schlosser's *Leben*, p. 475. Baum's *Beza*, II. 416. Schmidt, *Leben*, p. 272, says the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé each gave him one of his chief men. Simler, *Oratio*, p. 15, says: "Also Condé and the admiral gave Martyr at his departure two men from their household, who were both noble and military, who conducted him safe to Zurich." Martyr does not forget to mention these two escorts, though he does not give their names. On his way home, at Troyes, he wrote to Beza, Nov. 6, 1561: "Both the Captains, my guides, salute you very much." After his arrival in Zurich, Martyr wrote two letters on the same day (Nov. 25, 1561), one to Beza, the other to Calvin. He opens both by speaking of the generous reception the two captains had received from the Zurich authorities, who appointed escorts to conduct them back as far as Berne. To Calvin he says he was "conducted very safely and faithfully by two military leaders, whom they commonly call captains, pious and brave men." That Julio Terenziano accompanied Martyr back to Zurich, is clear from the fact that in both the above letters to Beza, from Troyes and Zurich, "my Julius also salutes you" (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1143, 1144).

offered him a sedan-chair, but Martyr gratefully declined this, apparently preferring the animal.¹³⁶

Leaving at the Court Beza (whom he never saw again in this world) and Des Gallars, Martyr set out from Paris on October 31st, and in twenty-two days arrived safely in Zurich on November 21, 1561.¹³⁷ His road lay through Provence, Nogent, and Troyes in the Champagne province, and apparently Dion (Dijon) in northern Burgundy; a route, if anything, perhaps a little more direct than the more southern way by which he had come. On November 5th, he arrived at Troyes, where he spent a few days.¹³⁸ It will be remembered that the Bishop of Troyes was Jean Anton Caracciolo, a native Italian, who had served as

¹³⁶ "How gladly," says Professor Baum, "would Beza also have sat thereon, as the venerable older fellow-combatant, surrounded by his stately escort, from his trusty and gentle mule, reached down his hand with a heavy heart at the parting. Into his big, brave, yet moistened eye he looked, and commended him and the churches of France to the Lord. They never again saw each other, for in the space of a year, while Beza in the tumult of war and the turmoil of battle defied death times without number, Martyr by the same was called away from the quiet and blessed professor's chair" (*Beza*, II. 416-417). Dr. Henirich Heppe has also a similar word on Martyr's departure (*Theodor Beza*, p. 150).

¹³⁷ To Calvin, Nov. 25, 1561: "I departed from Paris, most distinguished Sir, on the day before the Calends of November, and in twenty-two days I came safe and sound to Zurich." To Beza, Nov. 25, 1561: "On the 21st day of this month, most illustrious man and beloved brother in Christ, I came to Zurich safe and uninjured, and in all kinds of ways (*modis omnibus*) I am joyfully received (*hilariter exceptus*) by all classes of people in the city" (*Loc. Com.*, pp. 1143, 1144). Schmidt says (p. 272) Martyr left Paris on Oct. 30th. Beza wrote to Calvin, Oct. 30, 1561: "Only *Gallasius* remained with me, but for a few days, for *Martyr* will depart today." (Baum, *Beza*, II., Ap., p. 117). But Beza had also written Calvin on Oct. 21st, that Martyr would leave in three days (See note 131 above). He may not have known the exact day. It is possible that Martyr left St. Germain on Oct. 30th, and Paris the day following.

¹³⁸ To Beza from Troyes, Nov. 6, 1561 (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1143). Baum conjectures that Martyr rested at Troyes at the request of Beza (*Theodor Beza*, II. 417). Schlosser mistakenly makes it Tours, for Troyes (*Leben des Th. de Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermigli*, pp. 475-477).

Martyr's interpreter at the Colloquy. Without giving his real name, Martyr wrote to Beza a letter from Troyes (Nov. 6, 1561), in which he speaks of the growth of the Reformation there and the conscientious conduct of the Bishop. "The Church," he writes, "is exceedingly populous and is increased daily. The Bishop received us very kindly (perhumaniter). He is now earnestly promoting the kingdom of Christ, and he not only teaches his flock purely, but, as he had a conscientious doubt with regard to his calling, because in it he did not have the election or confirmation of the people, he therefore summoned the Elders of the Reformed Church and asked them piously and prudently to consider whether they would choose, confirm, and hold him as their Bishop. If they should think this the right thing to be done, he would endeavor, as he had begun, so to continue, by teaching and exhorting according to his powers, to build up and increase the Church committed to him. But if they should think him not fit for such a great office, they should say so freely and openly, and he was prepared to give up his position, if only he may live in a Church reformed according to the holy discipline of the Gospel. He also requested that in regard to this matter they would speedily deliberate with the Church. When this was done by all of them unanimously, he was acknowledged and received as a true Bishop. Wherefore his authority and piety are of great value (*multum commodat*) to the Church of Christ. May God be praised, who in this way governs and directs the kingdom of His Son!"¹³⁹

¹³⁹ *Loc. Com.*, p. 1143; Eng. Tr., pp. 159-160. Giovanni Antonio Caraccioli was the son of the distinguished Prince of Melphi. He became Bishop of Troyes in 1551, and died in 1569. Baum (*Beza*, II. 417-419) says he was a favorite at the French court, and calls him "a lively well-educated fellow, but also an over-gallant man of the world and an unsteady character." Schlosser (*Op. cit.*, pp. 475-477) observes that at first the Reformed clergy hesitated to grant his request for re-ordination because, for one reason, they knew that his conduct was not above question, and so referred the matter to the judgment of the church at Geneva, but that before Calvin's reply arrived, Martyr reached Troyes, assembled the ministers in the chief

In the same letter Martyr speaks of an uprising at Dion (Deuioni), in which the Reformed were attacked during a service, and won out only after seven houses had been plundered (*direptae*). Thereupon representatives were sent to the French Court in this matter, whose cause Martyr was asked to commend by letters to Admiral Coligny and to the Prince of Condé. But as Martyr's two guides dispatched letters to the Admiral and Prince by these men, Martyr thought it enough to send salutation through Beza, and ask him to perform this service.¹⁴⁰

Happy and sincere was the welcome which Martyr received in the city which had been loath to let him go, and which had always rejoiced to call him her own. He had been away almost three months.¹⁴¹ Glad as he was to reach home, he had come back with a heavy heart. The Colloquy he could never forget: its obvious futility, on the one hand, and on the other, the high and harmonious fellowship of a few choice spirits, the outstanding one of whom was the noble Theodore Beza.¹⁴² But the winter of 1561-1562 was

church of the city on Nov. 16, 1561, when he was chosen Bishop, with only one, a Peter le Roy, objecting. "This Bishop," continues Schlosser, "is, so far as we know, the only one whom the French Reformed Church knows, and even he had as little advantage from the affair as Martyr had honor." For, fearing the consequence of this example, the French Romanist Bishops protested to the Court, with the result that the Queen induced Caraccioli to surrender his bishopric, for which she assigned him a pension. Schlosser (p. 476, note) says that Martyr did not mean any harm, and writes Beza of the matter "quite briefly." See also M. Young's *Paleario*, I., pp. 484-485. And M'-Clintock and Strong: *Theological Cyclopaedia*, article on Caraccioli, Vol. XI., p. 794.

¹⁴⁰ While Martyr does not definitely say so, it is reasonably certain from the above that he did go through Dijon, the ancient *Divio*, which was about 200 miles southeast of Paris. Schlosser's statement (see preceding note) that he was in Troyes as late as Nov. 16th, may be an error. This would make him spend over ten days there, giving him only five days for the journey from Troyes to Zurich, which is not sufficient time, especially, as is likely, if he stopped long in Dijon.

¹⁴¹ From Aug. 26th to Nov. 21st. For his reception in Zurich, see note 137 above.

¹⁴² Only four days after he reached Zurich, Martyr wrote Beza,

one of religious upheavals and bloodshed for unhappy France. The Edict of October 18, 1561, was followed, after several other conferences, by the so-called "Edict of Saint Germain" (Jan. 17, 1562), and both were too mediating to satisfy either side. With the Massacre of Vassy, on March 1, 1562, came the signal for the civil wars which kept France a veritable volcano until the conclusion of the famous Edict of Nantes in 1598.¹⁴³ As Martyr died almost a year after his return from Poissy, he did not have to look upon those dark times. Yet his soul was heavy with serious apprehensions, and his body was fast giving way before the increasing debility of old age.¹⁴⁴

A final historical verdict as to the real cause of the failure

Nov. 25, 1561: "Further, you cannot believe how much our fellow ministers rejoiced on hearing of the harmony which continued sure and unimpaired among us the whole time we were together; and not undeservedly, for in the church what can be sweeter than brotherly agreement? (quid enim in Ecclesia dulcius esse protest fraterna coniunctione?). Mention is also made of you and the other brethren, and that very honorably. These are cheerful things, and, as I persuade myself, will refresh you not a little in your great labors" (*Loc. Com.*, p. 1144; Eng. Tr., p. 160). On the same day, in his letter to Calvin, he also spoke of this concord and the fellowship he could never forget (See above, note 132).

¹⁴³ On Nov. 25, 1561, Des Gallars wrote Martyr from Paris of the disturbed conditions in France, also in his own church (French) in London, and even in Scotland. The Protestants were increasing, thousands daily. "There is scarcely a city," he says, "and town in France where upheavals on account of religion have not arisen. But gradually they are settled, and some liberty is given to our side." "For the present," he adds, "Beza will remain here for some time, and perhaps for a long time, as expediency and necessity of things require." (Baum, *Beza*, II., App., p. 131). Beza did not return permanently to Geneva until May 5, 1563 (H. M. Baird: *Theodore Beza*, p. 228. H. Heppe: *Theodor Beza*, p. 226).

¹⁴⁴ For Martyr's apprehensions, see above, notes 106 and 109. Baum says (*Beza*, II. 419) that the most hearty welcome that Martyr and his associates received in Zurich could not banish from his soul the heavy gloom which the unhappy future of the churches of France and the foreboding of bloody and serious conflicts of the Gospel aroused in his mind. "He and many thousands," observes Baum, "were not to see the end of the same." On Martyr's distress and failing health, see also note 9 above.

of the Colloquy of Poissy is no part of this study. The burden of opprobrium has been laid upon Catherine de' Medici.¹⁴⁵ So far as Peter Martyr is concerned, the outstanding fact is, that at no time did he have any serious faith in the power of the Conference of Poissy to bring the two sides together into an intelligent and enduring union. From the very first he made this perfectly clear to Catherine.¹⁴⁶ And when everything good has been written about the effects of this conference that can be written, the fact will still remain that its net result for the cause of Christian union is almost imperceptibly small.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ Schmidt, in his *Leben*, blames Catherine: "If Catherine de' Medici had had another heart, she might have learned on which side the truth lay, and with it the salvation of France" (p. 250). "She no longer thought of desiring to settle religious controversy through the peaceful negotiations of theologians, but only of maintaining, through the artifices of her perfidious politics, or through the power of weapons her own supremacy in unhappy France" (p. 274). Schlosser is more restrained. H. Klipffel is unsparing of Catherine de' Medici, says that dissimulation was the dominant trait of her character, that good was only an accident in her long career, that she was totally deprived of moral sense. He calls her the evil genius of France, and says: "On the decision of a woman without genius and virtue was to depend the salvation or the ruin of a great people!" (*Le Colloque de Poissy*, pp. 18, 19, 28). The concluding chapter of Klipffel's valuable study (pp. 196-206) is largely a condemnation of Catherine's feeble and hesitant policy. Yet he does not lay it all at her door. "She sincerely desired the reconciliation of the religious parties; and if this reconciliation could not take place, it is not she alone whom history must blame for it" (p. 99. See pp. 204-205). He points out that Catherine knew the pitiful financial situation of France at this time, and she dreaded any radical religious innovations on account of the dire consequences of a ruin of the clergy, who possessed two-thirds of the royal revenue (pp. 57-63). Professor Henry M. Baird places among the causes Catherine's crude notion of a conference, her inability to treat with the Huguenots, the insignificant character of most of the prelates at the Colloquy, the influence of the papal legate, Ippolito D'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, etc. (*The Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 546-555). Baron Alphonse De Ruble thinks that the civil disorders preoccupied Catherine more than evangelical truth, but he lays special blame on Cardinal Lorraine for inviting the German Lutherans (*Le Colloque de Poissy*, pp. 14, 46).

¹⁴⁶ See above, on notes 51 and 55.

¹⁴⁷ Professor James Westfall Thompson, in *The Wars of Religion*

On the other hand, there is always in such gatherings a moral residuum which has its own valuation, even though the chief aim of the conference is not attained. To this Martyr was not blind. He saw the cunning diplomacy of the French court. He had come into confidential relations with one of the most noted women of that day. He felt what, as an Augustinian monk he must have known years before, the terrific power of the Papacy. He also met the noble Jeanne d'Albret, wife of the ignoble Antoine de Bourbon, King of Navarre, a man in whom Martyr had absolutely no faith at all.¹⁴⁸ His comradeship with Beza at

in *France, 1559-1576*, published 1909, says (p. 114) that the Colloquy of Poissy did nothing else than further to disunite the Protestant world, which might otherwise have had a council of its own, composed of French, Scotch, English, Germans, Danes, Swiss, and Swedes, to face the Council of Trent. From the Roman Catholic standpoint, Mgr. James F. Loughlin, S. T. D., of Phila., Pa., writes in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. V. (1909), p. 36: "In 1561 six French cardinals and thirty-eight archbishops and bishops, with a host of minor prelates and doctors, wasted in a barren controversy with the Calvinists an entire month, which might have been spent far more advantageously to the church and more in consonance with the duties of their offices had they taken their places in the Council of Trent."

Speaking of the Canons of the Conference, Dr. C. Schmidt observes: "That was all that the famous assembly accomplished. There were none but cardinals and bishops; and history has sufficiently shown that from such alone a reformation of the church is never to be expected" (*Leben*, p. 269). On Oct. 17, 1561, Hubert Languet wrote to Mordeisen: "With great pains and labor they accomplished nothing except to make themselves ridiculous." He recalled the fable of the mountain and the mouse (*Epistolae*, Bk. II., p. 149). Even Catherine, on Oct. 18, 1561, wrote her ambassador to Germany that she was amazed at the frivolous way in which spiritual men had passed over abuses touching their own standing (From Aymon, *Synodes nationaux des Eglises réformées de France*, Bk. I., p. 286. See also Schmidt, *ibid.*, p. 269).

¹⁴⁸ Martyr quickly discerned the fundamental difference between the King of Navarre and his wife. Soon after his arrival at St. Germain, he wrote (Sept. 12, 1561) to the Zurich Senate: "Imo etiam si eo zelo teneretur *Navarrus* quo ejus uxor: essent enim res longe meliori loco" (Baum's *Beza*, II., Ap. p. 62). On Sept. 18, 1561, John G. Stuckius wrote to Conrad Hubert, formerly Bucer's secretary at Strassburg, in almost the same language: "Quod si *Rex Navarrae* tantum animi, tantumque nervorum, quantum *Uxor* ipsius, haberet; res meliori pro-

Poissy only stressed more decidedly the high estimation in which Beza held Martyr.¹⁴⁹ No two men ever stood more on fundamentally common ground than did these at St. Germain; nor was any one's presence and counsel more helpful and welcome to Beza than Martyr's.¹⁵⁰

Summing up Martyr's part in this Conference, we note that, for the Reformed side, Beza was its spokesman, while Martyr was its theological adviser. And he was a thoroughgoing Calvinist.¹⁵¹ But a closer study of this *flecto essent loco*" (*Ibid.*, p. 67). See above, p. 430, (in Art. II.) and notes 34 and 52.

¹⁴⁹ On May 12, 1563, only a week after his return to Geneva, Beza wrote to the Zurich church that he had first heard of Martyr's death at Strassburg on his way home from France, "which wound," he adds, "although it is a common one to me and the whole church of God, yet to me privately it was most severe in the recent memory of the sweetest and most profitable intimacy with him, which I shall certainly preserve forever, as I ought" (Baum, *Beza*, II., Ap., p. 207. This is in the Zurich MSS., and is the last letter in the second appendix of Baum's book). The reference is to Beza's association with Martyr at Poissy. Cf. Schmidt's *Leben*, pp. 291-292. On March 2, 1562, Beza wrote from Paris to Bullinger: "I ask you to salute Dr. Peter Martyr, a father most esteemed by me" (Baum, II., Ap., p. 170; in the Genevan MSS.).

¹⁵⁰ Schlosser (*Leben d. Th. de Beza und d. P. M. Vermili*, pp. 471-472) observes how Martyr helped Beza out on a passage from Augustine; also how Martyr, who was sitting near to Beza when the latter was asked who had ordained him and Calvin, whispered in his ear to say that the laying on of hands was not necessary. According to Claude D'Espence, quoted in De Ruble (*Le Colloque de Poissy*, p. 37), Martyr was behind Beza and whispered to him to say that his choice had been confirmed "by the ecclesiastical magistrate" (Beza had said "civil" magistrate). D'Espence adds here that *he* questioned Beza as to who had laid hands on him, and that Beza confessed that by this means he was not a true minister, as he had not received imposition of hands. Of Martyr, Schlosser says (p. 472): "Indeed, so united was he with Beza, that he did not hesitate, when the latter in his violence (*Heftigkeit*) seemed to abandon the bounds of moderation, to oppose him openly." As support, Schlosser quotes in a footnote from the *Respons. ad Calvin. et Beza pro Francisco. Balduin* (Colon., 1564, 12, p. 144): "Tuus adessor Petrus Martyr, qui palam tibi reclamabat." See above, note 80.

¹⁵¹ Dr. E. Bloesch (professor at Bern), in his *Geschichte der Schweiz-erisch-Reformierten Kirchen*, 2 vols., 1898, Bern, says of Martyr: "He was a representative of the strict Calvinism, and as such contributed

gathering will show that Martyr's influence was something more dynamic than dogmatic counsel. It is not without some show of historical vindication to say that Martyr's position actually saved the Huguenots from yielding to a middle ground and adopting a compromise the inaccurate verbiage of which would only have insured drastic repudiation by both sides after the deliberations were closed. For real union, Martyr was as anxious as Catherine, though probably for other reasons than hers. But their ideas of union were totally different. Martyr was out for truth. He had changed his faith for that; left his country, endured hardship, devoted his life to it. And now, an old man, almost stepping into eternity, he was not going to throw away the indisputable findings of his whole career unless they were proved to be false and un-Scriptural. He wanted no conciliation that was not based on the revealed truth of the canonical Scriptures.

The position taken by Martyr at Poissy is part of his contribution to evangelical Protestantism. It is the contribution of the right of religious freedom guided by the authority of the inspired Word of God. And it was upon this distinguishing essential of the Reformed Theology in its pristine purity that Martyr knew the Huguenots of France would have to stand or fall. They fought and bled and died for it. He taught and wrote, debated and traveled, in defence of it. The unwavering confession of it was upon his lips when he died, and its unfailing consolation supported and sweetened the closing hours of his gentle and beautiful life.

Hillsboro, Ohio.

BENJAMIN F. PAIST, JR.

toward establishing more firmly dogmatic union between Zurich and Geneva." (Vol. II., p. 260). G. R. Zimmermann, *Die Zürcher Kirche, von der Reformation bis zum dritten Reformations-jubiläum (1519-1819)*, Zurich, 1878, thinks (p. 60) that Martyr's activity in Zurich was the cause of the Calvinistic type of theology prevailing above the Humanistic type, which had prevailed there since Zwingli. Cf. note 103 above.

THE JUSTIFICATION OF CAPITALISM

There is no greater need in the present state of Sociological discussion than a reasoned *apologia* for the Capitalistic order of society. Its assailants profess to be as confident as all those are who lead a forlorn hope. They are, in many cases, sincere in their convictions, and are at times moved by a vibrant moral passion. But there are many among them who have not considered the necessary roots of a living and organized society, and are held in the tyranny of a merely mechanical and sometimes materialistic conception of the social order. Their method is to lay down certain premises, and outline certain ideals, with fierce social and political demands, which every century has proved to be unreal and impossible. The one conclusion on which they all focus their assault is that Capitalism is an economic blunder and a social wrong. The question, therefore, to be asked is, Can Capitalism be justified? A fully reasoned answer would look along the three lines of History, of Economics and of Ethics. Here only an outline of the chief positions can be attempted.

I.

An affirmation sometimes made as though it were a penetrating discovery is that the present order of society is on its trial. That is merely a truism. Every order of society has always been on its trial. But that trial is not to be found in the indictment which may be made against it. An order of society stands, not at the judgment seat of those who seek to destroy it, but at the bar of reason and conscience. The verdict which is justified both by the argument and by the event, is the judgment of history. As Schiller so finely said: "The history of the world is the judgment of the world." Whatever endures and persists has reality and power.

Now the present order of society is based on Capitalism. What is Capitalism? It may be defined as an industrial order in which wealth, which has been saved and stored, is

employed in maintaining and rewarding labour so as to further production, under private ownership and control. The word Capital is derived from the Latin word *capita*, which meant so many "head" of cattle. That was the first form of capital. It has left its mark in the word "stock" which is applied, without any thought of its origin, to the shares of an industrial company. To-day capital is represented not by money, which is merely a token, but by those possessions which can be used for the maintenance and the well-being of the whole life of man. The Capitalist (the word is used so often with a scornful sneer) is simply a master of industry who takes a share of the product, as a return for his risk and oversight. Or, he may be one who lends his wealth, whether it be a few dollars or many thousands, to an employer of labour, or to a limited liability company, or to the State, and receives a reward in the dividend which is paid to him—although often he finds himself without reward at all, and loses all that he has risked in his enterprise. The term Capitalist, therefore, includes the great majority of the citizens of every civilized community. The depositors in savings banks, the shareholders in co-operative stores, the traders with single shops of their own, the settlers and small-holders, together with those who cultivate their farms and ranches and gardens, along with those who have invested their frugal savings in the shares of industrial companies, or in the stocks of the State, must be included among the Capitalists. It is upon this basis that the present order of society has been founded, and if the basis be destroyed, the present order must pass away with all that is bound up with it. Few of the fiercest opponents have ever faced all that such a change implies.

Every reflective listener to the opponents of Capitalism, who has a knowledge of the history of the past, is aware that the charges made against the present order of society are, in every regard, the repetition of the cries that have been heard in every century. The reckless accusations, the fierce invectives, the open expression of envious and greedy

ambitions, the threats of violence, all based on a strange ignorance of history, a stranger ignorance of economic law, a still stranger ignorance of human nature, and, strangest of all, upon a purely materialistic evaluation of human life and of its needs and desires, have been the notes of that long succession of historic assaults on the Capitalistic order of society. Their history has been the sure test of their invalidity. Whenever any social order has been tyrannical and base, or has become outworn and effete, it has passed away. It has passed into oblivion not really because of the forces massed against it, or primarily because of its frame and constitution, but because of its inefficiency and its corruption. "Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the vultures be gathered together." The undeniable power, the energy, the vitality of the present order of society is the first evidence of its historic justification.

On the other hand the judgments of history on the schemes and projects of every wrongly based and artificially constructed alternative order, coincide in their condemnation. Every experiment, in every brand of Communism, has ended in economic failure and social disaster. The theories and projects of the more widely-read and more cautious modern Collectivists—all so keenly critical and so logically destructive of each other—have never even been tried. Their advocates seem more willing to live by them, than to live for them, and they are certainly not willing to die for them. All the while that their mouths are filled with denunciations of the present order, they are well content to live under its shelter, and to share, what they proclaim to be its selfish security. Robert Owen brought himself to the direst poverty in the endeavour to prove that Communism could be made to work. The modern Socialist is not found stripping himself bare to make sure proof of his faith in his own method of reform. So that the broad verdict of history is that the present order of society, in spite of the faults and crimes of those who live within it has not failed. The marvel of these last few years of fierce wars,

which have squandered its gathered wealth, and of international hatreds which have checked the flow of its commerce, and issued in the consequent embittering distress in the realm of industry, is the singularly successful way in which the present order of society has stood the strain. The completing proof is seen in the honest endeavour now being made by Capitalism to bring in a new era of a wiser peace and a more equitable prosperity.

This historic proof, when examined, leads us down to the truth on which the permanence of Capitalism is based. That truth is that the only ground of the persistence of any organism is that it must fulfil a beneficent function. Occasionally, a rashly-spoken orator or a prejudiced writer, will be found to allege that Capitalism does not "function" at all. In a strict sense of the words that is true, for in reality it is not Capitalism that functions but the Capitalist, any more than it is the spade that digs, when in reality it is the digger. But by this charge it is meant that Capitalism is like a fifth wheel to the coach, or like the Old Man of the Sea on Sinbad's back. The attempts at proof come to nothing more than this—that Capitalism does not function in the way which is desired, or so beneficently as it ought to do. The truth is that if the Capitalist and Capitalism did not "function," and did not function beneficently, no man need waste his breath in denouncing it. The law is inevitable that any organ or organism which does not fulfil a valued function will pass away. A disused or abused member of the body withers. An unemployed gift or art is lost. An institution which discharges no real service decays and dies. A form of government which fails to govern, and to promote the well-being of the governed, has a certain doom. But Capitalism and the Capitalist persist. They have put on increasing strength with the enlargement and enrichment of society. They have withstood the assaults of centuries and have mocked at the theories of hare-brained enthusiasts, however well-meaning they may have been. As we have seen in Russia, Lenin and his Soviet have been com-

pelled to revert to Capitalism, after having impoverished the Russian people and sentenced them to horrible privations and untimely deaths.

II.

Capitalism then has received the sanction of history. It has also an economic justification.

The first line in this justification is that Capitalism increases the wealth, and, therefore, promotes the well-being of the community. The power to produce wealth will remain one of the primary tests of an industrial system. It is not the only test, but when we are reminded, to use the language of an inaccurate writer, that under Capitalism "Labour is bought and sold as an article of commerce, so that the workers are degraded to a condition of poverty and wage-slavery," we shall remember that it has this great distinction of producing abundance of wealth. It is time that all men purged their minds of that stupid fallacy that there can be too great abundance of wealth, and that the man who limits production, by any policy of what is known as "ca' canny," or by any slacking or malingering, or by the adoption of any wasteful method, is other than an enemy of the general well-being. The statement that too much wealth may be produced, can be left to the judgment and common sense of men. In truth the only hope for the attainment of a life for the average man, which shall be free from excessive toil, and have ample leisure and large opportunity, is the increase of wealth. Wherever the wealth of a community is limited, either in old civilisations, or in new and undeveloped lands, men are always on the verge of destitution. It is the consumer's first interest—and all men are consumers,—that the market-place should be stored with abundant wealth. The life of the working man of to-day has a quality and a richness and a social ease, not dreamed of a generation ago, because Capitalism has fulfilled this supreme function of producing wealth.

The second line is that Capitalism secures and develops

the efficiency of labour. Labour is helpless without Capital, but only as Capital is not only abundant and carefully stored, but under personal control, can it efficiently secure and develop labour. Some thoughtless speakers have declared that all that is required by labour is "the raw materials of nature." But whatever may have been true about "the raw materials of nature," in those far-off, meagre days of the dawn of history, the phrase has no meaning now. Everything labour now works upon is a portion of the store of Capital. To develop and secure efficient labour is the function of all Capital, and this efficiency is most skillfully, most economically and most wisely directed under private ownership and control. The Capitalist secures this efficiency not only by labour-saving and labour-easing and labour-perfecting inventions and machineries, but by untiring resourcefulness and sustained energy, and by the prevention of waste, and the encouragement of skill and of energy. One of its marked features is the power of a swift and untrammelled initiative. Only the individual Capitalist, or a small Directorate, can take such prompt and daring action as is required by a changing situation, a fresh opportunity, or a threatened disaster. The development of the resources of the world, the increased inter-relationships of commerce and industry, the organized systems of carriage and of social service, which some forms of Socialism wish to bring entirely under State control, were all originated and brought to efficiency by the foresight, courage, skill, and energy of individual minds.

Even more distinctive in this regard is the resourcefulness and economy in management and adaptation. Here the contrast with public management is almost a scandal. The outcry about the hide-bound methods and red-tape procedure of State departments, the record of the sloth and incompetence and insolence of public officials, the revelations of the multiplication of offices with wasteful salaries, might cast out of every man's mind any ignorant and shallow approval of State control. Every government has been com-

pelled to "fire" official after official, to reconstruct Boards of management, and, at last, to call in individuals of skill and resourcefulness and courage, and to clothe them with the power of the Capitalist, so as to save not only the resources, but the life of the nation. The reason behind all this is that the Capitalist is motivated by a large number of potent incentives. He may be a patriot with a desire to benefit his countrymen. He may be a wise-minded lover of humanity, as Robert Owen was at the beginning of his career. Or he may be inspired by self-interest. But self-interest is not selfishness, nor need it pass to that degradation. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*"—not more than thyself—is the finely-balanced command. Self-interest is as necessary as self-preservation, which is simply its first line of action. Self-interest becomes selfishness only when it neglects and injures the interests of others. But a Capitalist who promotes the efficiency of labour advances not only his own interests, and the interests of those who co-operate with him, but the well-being of the community. The perfect adaptation of his equipment, the watchful and capable superintendence of the work, and the goodwill of those whom he employs, are the interest of the Capitalist, and these work together to secure the efficiency of labour.

A third line in this justification is that capital meets the variety and complexity of modern civilisation. Its assailants do not face the whole breadth of life when they are dealing with the problems of the social order. They focus their thoughts entirely on the conditions of life in a crowded city or an industrial centre. The problems of agriculture, the greatest and most important industry, are passed by either in silence, or with a meagre attention. But human life and well-being form a much more complex adventure than the production and distribution of material wealth. There are supreme interests of humanity whose variety and complexity make demands that only a wisely organised Capitalism can supply. There are ideals and hopes and joys which will be quenched if there be no power to exercise the indi-

vidual will. There are thousands of men and women who have no care at all what share they have in the world of political ambition or industrial preeminence. The problems of economics interest them no more than they interested Jesus. There are millions of the best men and women to whom literature and art and music, research and discovery, the triumphs of learning and scholarship, and, above all, the truths and obligations of religion are the objects of their devotion. Only as men are free, even at the cost of their worldly comfort, only as they have power to acquire the means to prosecute these nobler enterprises, can they exercise themselves in the variety and complexity of modern life. The solution sometimes offered is that there shall be a common "pool" of the product of labour out of which a "subsistence dividend" might be given to every individual, whether he laboured or not. In this way, it has been argued, one man might devote himself to the cultivation of art, another to the intellectual life, another to an ascetic and lonely religious devotion. Apart from the injustice of this proposal, it is corrupting to the idler to eat bread he has not earned. Mr. Dooley poured his witty scorn upon this absurd suggestion in the comment that the job he would choose would be to employ himself in feeding the swans in Central Park. This kind of talk is dying down. The modern Socialist will not face the problem, or if he does he is compelled to admit that at present there is no method of the solution under his theory. He is compelled to admit that Capitalism does face the variety and complexity of life, but, as he alleges, at too great a cost to things he considers of greater value.

The fourth line of justification is that Capitalism conserves the well-being of the family and the home. Here we come upon one of the most condemning facts in the history of all Collectivism. The Christian Ethic has settled once for all the ideal of the marriage of one man and one woman, with the consequent building of a home, in which their children can be sheltered and trained. The noblest moral

passions of the human heart find their exercise in the ordering of the life of the home, the maintaining of its atmosphere of trust and affection, and the provision for the wants and the whole well-being of the household. That can be attained only under the power to acquire and hold such resources as Capitalism can furnish, and to expand them in such methods, as the ideals of duty and destiny which the heads of the family may cherish.

But, in a glance, it can be seen that this assertion of the family and the rights of the family is fatal to Collectivism, and as a consequence every historic form of Collectivism has struck at the family and the home. Rousseau the early modern prophet of Socialism, committed his five children, as soon as they were born, to the care of a public institution, and disordered the mind and broke the heart of the poor creature who gave them birth. The Communists of the past, with their phalansteries, held that children should be the common property of the industrial settlement. Some modern Socialists have gone farther, as can be seen in Karl Marx's declaration in the *Communist Manifesto*. They have demanded that Christian marriage shall be discontinued, and declared the woman's right to promiscuous intercourse. The most common form is to be found in the project of committing the offspring to the care of institutions, where trained nurses and teachers shall bring up the children. These counsels are supported usually by childless women, for motherhood is, as a rule, too wise to suggest such cold-blooded cruelty. But the most emphatic proof is given by the regulations of some of the thorough-going Russian Soviets. They drew up elaborate rules for "the use of the woman," with consequent public provision for the care of progeny. The simple peasant rebelled against laws which outraged every pure and holy feeling, and he doggedly held possession of the land—the highest form of capital—simply because he saw that no otherwise can a family and a home be maintained. It will be noted that the ethical question of the family and the home is not raised in this discussion al-

though it cannot be quite thrust aside. The point which is taken is the simple economic fact that the family, and not the individual, is the true unit of the economic order, and that every family has its indefeasible rights, which can be maintained and exercised only under Capitalism.

III.

We pass now to a brief resume of the moral, or ethical, justification of Capitalism. It must be brief not only because of reasons of space, but because a simple statement ought to be sufficient on ethical questions, to any who have even a slight acquaintance with the teaching of Christ.

The first ethical reason is that only under Capitalism can the individual secure his personal freedom. A personal liberty, as with all true freedom, must leave a man free to exercise his will toward the whole environment of life. That does not mean that a man may do what pleases him in every case, or may live his life at his own caprice, without regard to his neighbor's. We may say that freedom includes the right to possess property and to use it in any way that does not conflict with the well-being of society; to buy and to sell with a freedom which does not hamper or limit either his mode of living or his tastes in so far as he can gratify them without injuring his neighbour; to work or not to work if he will take the consequences, and remember that this includes the right to starve; to accept or to refuse conditions of work he thinks unjust; to strike, along with his group of workers, as a protest against unfairness, and also to lock out those who have worked for him, and worked with him, if they refuse to accept the conditions agreed upon, or attempt to impose regulations he believes to be fatal to the success of the industry.

But when a man becomes a hireling of the State, or a member of a hide-bound industrial organisation, he always loses his freedom. If Capitalism were to be abolished, he would be absolutely helpless against the fiat of some dominating committee. Even in countries where Capitalism is

still the basis of the social order, it has occasionally happened that some committee has introduced the Collectivist ideal, and at once thousands of men have become little more than serfs. In a great miner's strike in England, organised by men who seem to be utterly ignorant of economics, there were thousands of men compelled to strike, because they did not dare to disobey the command of a Junta who controlled their actions. They knew that the demand was economically impossible, and that the policy would issue in disaster, as it has done to their irretrievable loss and impoverishment. In the United States of America President Harding is at this moment contemplating the exercise of the forces of the Republic to vindicate the rights of men to freedom against the tyranny of a controlling society. Few men, even with the glaring example of Russia before their eyes, realise the extinction of individual freedom inevitable under Socialism or can imagine the fetters which such an economic method binds on both the body and the mind of the individual. It was wittily expressed a few years ago, while a great strike was going on in the lines:—

“When each has got his task assigned
By the elect who give the orders,
A ‘Merry England’ we shall find
Of convicts, and of prison warders.”

This question of freedom is ethically vital. Without it there can be no real personal liberty. Without it the highest moral life cannot be maintained. Without it life's relationships are not only in bondage, but they begin to wither. Without it all the fine ethical virtues of foresight and frugality, of self-denial and self-sacrifice, and even the graces of liberality and of the succouring of friends and comrades lies beyond our power. As Aristotle said in his *Politics*, “Even for the pleasure of the thing it makes an unspeakable difference to regard a piece of property as one's own. The Community idea robs us of the virtue of generosity in what we own.” Aristotle looked at the question with the eye of a Greek. We look at it with the eye which has been taught to

regard life by Christ. To the Collectivist who is busy with the questions of industry and with the effort to reduce disparities between those who have more and those who have less, who seem to think that security is the highest good to be attained, we reply that "the life is more than meat" and that a "man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." We remind him that it has been in the furtherance of those great causes, into whose advancement men have thrown their free energies, that manhood has reached its highest stature. A toil-worn, self-denying freeman is on a higher moral plane than a well-fed pensioner of the public purse.

The ethical argument culminates in the truth that Capitalism provides varied and powerful incentives. Every student of human nature is aware that men need incentives both to work and to play, to save and to spend, to be content and to aspire. In morals, motive is all important. If men would live only from high and unselfish motives, a just and beneficent and disciplining economic order would evolve, under Capitalism, as naturally as a stalk of corn from the seed. Yet, with all defects, Capitalism provides more varied and more potent moral motives than any other social order which has been suggested. Few men act from a single motive, nor is that to be demanded or desired. There is a hierarchy of motives, and the compelling motive of an action may not be the highest, and yet may be entirely worthy. The truth is that the incentives to action must appeal to human nature, as it is, and must meet all life's circumstances. Now and again in an hour of rare inspiration every man will act from a single heroic motive. Now and again there appear men and women who live out their lives under the dynamic of a supreme noble passion. Yet both history, and our common knowledge of ourselves, declare that men act from many motives, and that all the motives which are pure and purifying are justifiable, and are the required incentives for a moral life.

If we look at this matter in a simple concrete way the

truth lies in clear light. We have only to realise what a piece of work is a man, to take a just and accurate view of human nature, and to keep in mind how complex is the mingling of the natural and the spiritual within him, to realise the necessity for a whole series of incentives and motives. He has a body, and the motive of the supply of its necessities is worthy. It is the first imperative of life. He has a mind, and a heart, and a soul, and all their affectional and emotional and mystic desires demand wise and healthful satisfaction. He is a spirit, and all the intimations and visions of the inner world meet and excite and control his longings and desires. Whether he be Alexander on his throne, or Diogenes in his tub, he is a complex being, living in an appealing world, and moved by necessary, varied and potent incentives. The more fully and richly these appeal to him, and the more vitally he is moved by them, he becomes more truly a man.

Capitalism alone supplies these motives, for Socialism would not have allowed Diogenes to own even his tub. Capitalism demands that every man shall work, and shall not receive a weekly dole, and therefore, makes work a necessity, realising that all men need this imperative. Capitalism condemns the idle, whether the idle rich or the idle poor, with equal moral scorn. It is so intent on production, that it regards the man who has no share in some productive work, as a waster of its substance. It brings all the incentives that bear upon tender affection and upon high ambition in order to arouse and to stimulate the will to steadfast action. It follows the wisdom of the Old Testament in the philosophy of the Book of Proverbs by holding out the rewards of honesty, frugality, and foresight. It follows the wisdom of the New Testament in appealing to men to be faithful and loyal to the highest, even unto death. On the one hand it opens up positions of power and authority to skill and ability and unsparing toil. On the other hand it moves men to high adventure, to quick resource, to dangerous risks. But beyond all these things it realises that man does not live by bread alone, and, therefore, gives him the opportunity of opening

doors into realms of being and of doing, which are more alluring than security and daintiness. It is notable that while there may be Socialists who, having been trained within the school of Christian Ethics, still adhere to their high ideals, and endeavour to flush their hopes and to direct their advocacy by an appeal to the teaching of Jesus, yet so destructive to the moral ideal, looking broadly, is this pursuit of a Socialism which limits human freedom and robs men of high incentive, that too often not only are the laws of Christ ignored, but even the time-honoured teaching of the second table of the Ten Commandments is despised.

Glasgow, Scotland.

W. M. CLOW.

NOTES AND NOTICES

EZEKIEL'S SANCTUARY AND WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY

Any alteration in the accepted conclusions regarding Ezekiel's temple-vision must have its reaction on the hypothesis, dominant among present-day critics, of the late origin of the Mosaic law. For the Graf-Wellhausen theory Ezekiel xl.-xlviii. acts as a centre-pin which holds the fabric together: in these chapters the prophet is supposed to have codified the former temple praxis in order to preserve for posterity the impulse of the Deuteronomic revival with its insistence upon the centralisation of worship at Jerusalem. In the critics' own phrase Ezekiel xl.-xlviii. is "the key of the Old Testament,"¹ or as Delitzsch puts it, "The Book of Ezekiel has become the Archimedean point on which the Pentateuchal criticism has planted itself, and from which it has lifted off its hinges the history of worship and literature in Israel as hitherto accepted."²

If it be shown that Ezekiel's sanctuary was not at Jerusalem but at Shechem, the effect upon the critical theory must be decisive. The supposition which gives life to the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is that the priests who influenced Ezekiel, the sponsors of Deuteronomy, and the priests who in turn were influenced by Ezekiel, the authors of the Priestly Code; were so animated by the desire to secure the supremacy of their own sanctuary that they were prepared to adopt illegitimate measures to secure it. "My whole position," says Professor Wellhausen, "is contained in my first chapter"³—that on "The Place of Worship," where it is assumed without discussion

¹ "Ezekiel first pointed out the way which was suited for the time. He is the connecting link between the prophets and the law. He claims to be a prophet, and starts from prophetic ideas: but they are not his own ideas, they are those of his predecessors which he turns into dogmas. . . . The chapters xl.-xlviii. are the most important in his book, and have been called by J. Orth, not incorrectly, the key of the Old Testament."—Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*, p. 421.

"The decisive importance of this section for the criticism of the Pentateuch was first recognized by George and Vatke. It has been rightly called the key of the Old Testament."—Smend, *Ezekiel*, p. 312.

² Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1880, p. 279.

³ *History of Israel*, p. 368.

that for a Jewish priest no other central sanctuary than Jerusalem could be dreamed of.

Let us briefly recall the proof that Ezekiel was thinking of another sanctuary.^{3b} (1) His temple stands 500 reeds, or a mile, square, on the south side of a very high mountain. But nothing approximating to such a site can be found at Jerusalem. (2) Though he is admittedly the most methodical and meticulous of writers, his division of Palestine becomes impracticable if his sanctuary be placed at Jerusalem; it is, to quote his latest expositor, Dr. Lofthouse, "glaringly in defiance of actual topography," "so grotesque a transformation."⁴ Surely a theory which starts with an assumption which introduces the element of the grotesque, and leads it to accuse the author of its "key of the Old Testament" of having therein lost all his practical instincts, invites a search for a fatal flaw. (3) The measurements of the plan definitely indicate Shechem, as can be conveniently shown from statements of critical writers themselves. "The truth is," says Dr. Lofthouse, "that he (Ezekiel) is now simply thinking of the Temple as the centre of the country. . . . The Temple lies at the exact centre of the whole system."⁵ Place beside that the statement of Sir George Adam Smith, equally unquestionable, that the Vale of Shechem is "the true physical centre of Palestine," "its obvious centre," "the natural centre of the land,"⁶ and the inference could not be plainer. (4) With the sanctuary at Shechem the division of the land becomes practicable, and Zion takes its natural and, one would say, inevitable place as city in the scheme. (5) The allusions of the vision point to the northern kingdom, not to Jerusalem: (a) the command to remove the carcasses of the kings (xliiii. 7-9) is unnatural as applied to David's line, natural as applied to Jeroboam's; (b) uncircumcised strangers, whose introduction is reprobated in xlv. 6-8, never officiated in Solomon's temple, but offered sacrifice in Shechem in the persons of the ancestors of the Samaritans; (c) the course of the waters from the sanctuary (xlvii. 8) suggests a more northerly stream than the Kidron. (6) Ezekiel in placing the altar of the re-entered tribes at Shechem agreed

^{3b} See Art. "The City and the Sanctuary" in this REVIEW for July, pp. 399ff.

⁴ *The Prophet of Reconstruction* (1920), p. 195.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 209, 210.

⁶ *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 324, 120, 345.

with the precedent set by Abraham, Jacob, and Joshua, on their several entrances, and also with such predictions as Isaiah ii. 2, and Psalm lx. 6.

Was Ezekiel playing a lone hand here and breaking with Deuteronomic tradition? The Book of Deuteronomy itself gives no evidence that he was doing so. While it emphasises the centralization of worship and has as its burden "the place which the LORD your God shall choose," it never mentions Jerusalem, but directs the Israelites towards Mounts Gerizim and Ebal (xi. 29, 30), specifically commands the rearing of the national altar on the latter (xxvii. 4, 5), and eulogises the territory of Joseph in terms which form a striking contrast to the corresponding silence concerning that of Judah (xxxiii. 13-15, cf. 7). In spite of this, the critical theory has hitherto found no difficulty in assuming that the sanctuary in whose interests Deuteronomy was composed was that on Moriah, and the mention of the mountains of Shechem is brushed aside as a "later addition." Thus Dr. Driver says on Deut. xii. 5, "The standing phrase in Dt. for the central sanctuary. . . . of course the place tacitly designated by the expression is Jerusalem;"⁷ and on Deut. xxvii. "The chapter presents considerable critical difficulties. . . . It stands in a most unsuitable place. . . . It is hardly possible that the chapter can form part of the original Dt. It seems that a Deuteronomic nucleus has been expanded by the addition of later elements, and placed here, in an unsuitable context, by a later hand."⁸ Whose later hand? Was Samaritan agent or primitive humorist responsible for an expansion so directly in contradiction to the purpose which it is asserted called forth the book? History and the critics are equally silent on the point; but others must share the uneasiness expressed by Sir George Adam Smith when he writes, "That the only sanctuary mentioned by the Book of Deuteronomy should be the capital of Samaria, is surely an element to be taken into consideration of the question whether that book arose out of an agitation in favour of a central sanctuary at Jerusalem. If it did, it is strange that Ebal is so honoured, while Jerusalem is not once mentioned."⁹

⁷ *International Critical Commentary*, p. 140.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 294-5.

⁹ *Historical Geography*, p. 334, Note 1.

It is strange too that an hypothesis which appeals so confidently to "a judgment pronounced in accordance with the facts"¹⁰ should so casually fit such a fact to the theory. But if the story of the Deuteronomic revival culminates in, and collides with, the concentration of Ezekiel upon a temple at Shechem, the point can no longer thus lightly be disposed of. If Ezekiel was influenced by Deuteronomy, he regarded it not as intended to establish the supremacy of the temple on Moriah, but as recalling the original sanctuary of Shechem. And if this was the trend of its influence, it becomes impossible to believe that priests of Jerusalem would use unorthodox methods to fabricate it, or conspire to impose it on the nation. If it was in the temple in 621 B.C. and treated with reverence by the Jewish priesthood when discovered, its origin and its claim to sanctity must be found in a pre-temple era, and in an outlook which went beyond Solomon's temple.

With Ezekiel no longer playing his part as the representative and transmitter of the centralization-at-Jerusalem impulse, the theory of the development of his ideas in a post-exilic Priestly Code is left in the air. The assumption of his influence over his priestly successors, enlarged upon by the critics owing to the necessities of their hypothesis, finds little or no support in history. If the repatriated Jews considered Ezekiel's scheme at all, it was only to be discouraged by the futility of attempting to realise it; ideas which they might have appropriated from him, such as the separation of the sanctuary from the city, and the foursquare shape of the latter, they completely ignored; in such a matter as the status of strangers in the community they went directly and deliberately counter to his directions (cf. Ezek. xlvii. 22-23, with the note on which both the Books of Ezra and of Nehemiah conclude): and his code has always been regarded by the Jews as more perplexing than authoritative. If it were indeed at this period, and from ulterior motives, that the Pentateuch took shape, we might qualify Professor Wellhausen's remark, that "Jerusalem and the temple, which, properly speaking, occasioned the whole arrangement, are buried in silence with a diligence which is in the highest degree surprising,"¹¹ with the suggestion that it is even more

¹⁰ Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*, p. 34.

¹¹ *Hist. of Israel*, p. 164.

surprising that a priesthood so astute and unscrupulous should have overdone the camouflage to the extent of retaining Ezekiel's plan in the Canon, and permitting his Samaritan sanctuary to keep its central place in the narrative of the Hexateuch.

But the point need not be laboured. With the proof that Ezekiel's sanctuary is at Shechem, the critical hypothesis which has dominated a generation of theological study, and which has had insidious results in quarters where the names of its authors are unknown, is revealed as an absurd violation of commonsense. The man in the street will not be persuaded that priests of Jerusalem concocted, or doctored, the sacred books in their own interests, when Deuteronomy, the "starting-point" for the hypothesis, Ezekiel xl.-xlviii. its "key," and the historical narrative itself alike centre themselves upon the rival and bitterly hated sanctuary of Shechem.

Glasgow. Scotland.

C. M. MACKAY.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE

Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages. Lectures delivered at Princeton University, on the Louis Clark Vanuxem Foundation. By MAURICE DEWULF, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Louvain and in Harvard University. Published by the Princeton University Press, 1922. Pp. 313. \$1.00.

Strictly this is rather an effort to prove that the Philosophy of the Middle Ages is the outgrowth of its Civilization, than a study of the two. The extent of the theme forbidding a complete survey, the author has centered on the 13th century, as being "the watershed of European genius in its diverging flow." It evinces wide reading and is filled with valuable information. Naturally, the author has deep admiration for his chosen field, and his praise of the Social Structure of the 13th century is very high. All histories of a period have much in common. The chief points peculiar to Prof. DeWulf's study seems to be the following. Judgment on any epoch should not be by comparison with some other age—especially not by the standard of our times. "If we are to estimate aright the civilization of the thirteenth century, we must refer it to a fixed norm: *the dignity and worth of human nature.*" The many-sided civilization of the 13th century as a worthy and harmonious expression of the "*essential nobility of human nature,*" entitles it to a rank very high among the ages of history, in the author's view. Precisely what is meant by this method of historical criticism seems uncertain—it is at least interesting.

Scholasticism is accepted as the completest expression of the age. But De Wulf rejects emphatically the widely accepted view that Scholastic Philosophy "is philosophy in the service of doctrine accepted by the Church, or in such subordination to this doctrine that the doctrine becomes the absolute norm for what they have in common." (Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.*, quoted by De Wulf, for refutation.) His endeavor to defend its independence of Theology cannot, however, escape the fact that Scholastic Philosophy in its most orthodox and most authoritative forms—and especially in the works of Aquinas—is definitely used to defend the Doctrine, nor dares to permit itself to be in conflict.

Feudalism is evidently regarded as almost a model form of society, and its "*sentiment par excellence* which is still deeply embedded in our modern conscience, is *the sentiment of the value and dignity of the individual man.*" But the hardly oppressed peasants who rose under

Wat Tyler in England and the wretched Jacquerie of France who were slaughtered by thousands by the King of Navarre, the Count de Foix and the Captal de Buch, for daring to seek some surcease of their hopeless servitude, might have voiced a different opinion of their overlord's conception of their "*dignity and value*." And it was the hardy burghers of Ghent rather than their feudal lord, the Count of Flanders, against whom they bravely struggled under Philip von Artevelde, who had the better conception of the worth of the individual man.

And the author's study is lessened in value by its one-sided overestimate of the period of which he treats. Indiscriminate praise is bestowed on practically all mediaeval institutions and Scholastic Philosophy, in particular, is credited with teaching almost every noble and fertile idea which has been painfully realized in later ages. That the author is able to find quotations which seem to support his position is true, but isolated ideas do not change the whole trend of a system of thought. One can find in Plato's *Republic* anticipations of many things in our Constitution, but his completed conception of the State would have framed a totally different "Republic" from that in which we are so greatly blessed. France is given credit for almost all the civilizing work of the period, and the Benedictine monks of Cluny and later of Citeaux are unquestionably considered as far the greatest factor in the whole development, till he can assert "Cluny christianized feudalism," a position which is undoubtedly exaggerated.

The Papacy is quite carefully kept in the background—strangely so, at first reading, when one remembers its enormous power in that age, but not so strangely when one also recalls the later and dreadful consequences of its usurped authority. And the study of Scholastic Philosophy in spite of many references to other writers and frequent quotations from them, is really an exposition and laudation of the mighty work of Thomas Aquinas. Around his system, it is hardly too much to say, the whole book centers. Inasmuch as the Thomistic Philosophy and Theology are the officially accepted expression of Roman Catholic belief, the work under review is, whatever may have been the author's purpose, a carefully wrought praise of its Mediaeval foundations with as equally careful concealment of all its weaknesses and errors. For there is practically no notice of any of the abuses which culminated so disastrously a few centuries later.

An occasional statement gives one some suspicion of the philosophical accuracy of the author's views. "*The individual alone exists*. Such is the fundamental doctrine of scholastic metaphysics," is a rather strong statement. Yet the work is interesting, for it *was* a great age of which the author treats, and it is filled with a great variety of profoundly important information to all students of the history of thought.

Fulton, Mo.

DANIEL S. GAGE.

GENERAL THEOLOGY

An Encyclopaedia of Religions. By MAURICE A. CANNEY, London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. 1921.

This single volume of three hundred and ninety-seven pages seeks to present "information about most of the ancient and modern religions, ethnic and historical." The author, an Oxford scholar, has been for the past ten years professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in Manchester University. Single handed he sets out upon what he concedes to be a bold undertaking, that of preparing a moderate sized book to cover much of the ground claimed by Comparative Religion. His venture is tentative, and if acceptable, will be subsequently expanded. The limitations of a one man authorship are at once apparent. Great subjects are illuminated, not by up-to-date contributions from the pens of living authorities, but by extensive quotations from books supposed to be authoritative, although some of them are already "away behind the times." "The New Theology" gets its exposition solely from the eulogy passed upon it fifteen years ago by R. J. Campbell, and which he had to repudiate in large part in order to be admitted to the Church of England. Blunt's *Dictionary of the Sects*, of the 1903 edition, is relied upon to give accurate information regarding such "Sects" as the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and consequently there is no reference to the fact that in 1906 a union took place between this church and the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

It would be interesting to learn what has been Professor Canney's principle of selection, if indeed he has had any, in deciding what sects or churches should be considered by his volume. One would readily infer from the article on "Presbyterians" that the history of the Presbyterian Church has been confined to England and Scotland. The Baptists, the Brownists and the Wesleyan Methodists are given a fair degree of provincial consideration, but there is no attempt to delineate the history and tenets of the Roman Catholic Church or the Protestant Episcopal or Anglican Church, and the Lutheran Church is not even mentioned. It is surprising to learn that Universalism has become a powerful denomination in the United States. As this encyclopaedia claims to be a special dictionary dealing with the material provided by the science of Comparative Religion, it would hardly seem necessary to introduce subject matter which can easily be found in any Bible Dictionary. However, the whole question of the Canon of the Scriptures, and of the origin, composition, etc., of the different books of the Bible are considered, and that from the viewpoint of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, to which, by the way, Professor Canney contributed a number of articles, his first literary ventures. In the realm of the specific information promised by the title of this volume, the author has compiled and condensed a large amount of useful material. Topics discussed today in the History of Religion, the Psychology of Religion

and the Comparative Study of Religion are considered in convenient alphabetical order, and the student who wishes to have at hand a small work of reference, embodying the opinions of well known investigators and writers, will find Professor Canney's volume a very serviceable aid.

Princeton.

J. ROSS STEVENSON.

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought. By HORACE BLAKE WILLIAMS. The Abingdon Press: New York and Cincinnati. 1922. 8vo., pp. 181.

The purpose of this attractive volume is to present "in the light of modern thought" the facts and truths that are essential to eternal life. Chief among these facts and truths are "the Reality of the Unseen," "Life's Demand for a Religion," "Jesus Christ the Answer to Life's Supreme Demand," "History's Testimony to Jesus' Claim," the Fact of "Evil," the Fact of "Freedom," the Reality of "Truth" as manifested in the life of Christ, the Possibility of Perfection in the sense of a life "controlled and inspired" by one aim, and that to "know and to do the will of God," the Realization of self through self-renunciation, "Life and Death," "the Risen Lord."

These facts or truths are set forth clearly and often impressively. The whole discussion, however, is vitiated by its concessive spirit. Thus, the reality of our Lord's miracles is conceded, but they are affirmed to be "weights rather than wings"; his virgin-birth is granted, but it is said to be merely incidental, to be proved by our Lord's deity rather than as itself attesting it; Christ is clearly presented as our Saviour, but it is only by instruction and example; the necessity of truth is asserted, but its primacy as compared with life is denied; finally, the cross is ignored. That is, while the foundations of the faith are vindicated, that which is the foundation of them all is not even considered. It is not enough to regard Christ as "the desire of all nations": he is that because he is "the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world."

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The Future Life, Fact and Fancies. By F. B. STOCKDALE. The Abingdon Press: New York and Cincinnati. 1921.

This is a great book, though it numbers only one hundred and eleven small pages. It claims to be merely "fact and fancy," but the reviewer ventures to think that no more telling argument for immortality has been put forth for many a day. It is founded, as is Christianity, on the assumption that you can depend on law. It does not assume a law to hold up its teaching, but it does presume to trust the law that it has discovered in realms where it has not seen the law's

complete fulfilment, or application. It takes for granted that having found the law, you can apply it in all places. The size of the thing that reveals the law will circumscribe the application of the law it reveals. The feather falls for the same reason as a mountain. The uniformity demands and guarantees immortality. This is the argument in a nutshell.

This argument is worked out along several lines.

1. The kingdom of heaven, as the kingdom of nature, must be entered as a little child. We must be ready to experience what we cannot explain. We must be careful to avoid what would deaden our sensibility to such experience. We must not immerse ourselves in a naturalistic world and then expect to know "the power of an endless life." The truth with psychical research is that it seeks the spiritual with physical instruments.

2. "The singular has not yet been found." There are in the world life and death but life is the positive. We die daily because we discard daily what we have outgrown. The infant form is thrown off that the youth may be, the youth is thrown off that the man may be, but this is not the work of death, it is the proof of life. Death is the name we give the proof of life when it goes beyond our ken. Should we, however, distrust the law of change because we cannot follow it? Is it too wild a thing to imagine that, as we have watched the birth of insect or bird, or have awaited with keen anxiety the coming of new little life in human form, there are folk in the other world who with great interest watch this soul break out of this shell of a body? We know the soul goes as surely as the bird hatches (p. 63).

3. Personality wears innumerable forms but it has but one habit. The forms are changed with kaleidoscopic rapidity, but the habit never changes. This simple fact is sufficient ground for faith in immortality. If it were the only reason that nature gives it would be sufficient for all the faith we shall ever need to use. All life spends the now getting ready for the then. Every form of life lives for the form it has not attained. The whole universe is face forward.

4. "The leaps of life" strengthens the argument. In every sense we have lived by law. "Belief in the continuity of personality is not more difficult than faith in that through which we have already come."

5. "All the great experiences of life are impossible save in one direction." We must go to them; they cannot come to us. This is one of the fundamental limitations. We find it in every realm. It is unreasonable, therefore, to expect communications from those who have passed to the other side. "Study your medium wherever you will and you will find as might have been anticipated, "that it is always faith" (p. 103).

6. The law of instinct is invariable. Every instinct has a real object. We may argue the latter from the former. It cannot be otherwise in the case of the instinct for immortality. So true is this that silence must give consent, and no news from the other world be good news.

Such in bare and imperfect outline is Mr. Stockdale's argument. The reviewer wishes that it might induce many to read for themselves the author's clear and often scintillating paragraphs. No one who would believe in the "life everlasting" could fail to have his faith confirmed and his hope strengthened. Not that the argument is demonstrative. The author himself would not claim that for it. The spiritual and the physical are not identical. This was the mistake of Drummond's great book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. "To prove the continuance of existence is not the same as to prove the continuance of personality." Yet we venture to affirm—and partly as the result of reading this book—that the reasons for believing in the personality of the future life are far larger than the belief.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Book of Job. BY MOSES BUTTENWIESER, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Exegesis, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Author of "The Prophets of Israel." New York: The Macmillan Co. 1922. 8vo. pp. xiv, 370.

The publishers correctly say of this book that it "does not tread the old well worn paths." Professor Buttenwieser, while speaking of the Book of Job in the highest terms and quoting with approval the judgment of another that Job is "one of the grandest things ever written with pen," takes liberties with the text of this ancient masterpiece which clearly indicate that he believes that it admits of very marked improvement. Dr. Buttenwieser attempts "the reconstruction of chapters 16-37" on the basis of "a careful study, covering many years, of both the Hebrew text and the ancient versions." He believes that there is evidence for what he calls "extreme text-disorder in chapters 16-37," for which he finds, as he believes, an explanation in the hostility "with which the book met in the writer's own day." He tells us that "without a doubt the book was considered sacrilegious, and it is not unconceivable, in fact it is easily possible that the scroll may have been torn up to be publicly burned, just as 200 years previously the prophecies of Jeremiah were torn up by Jehoiakim before being consigned to the flames." The "text-disorder" in this group of chapters will be illustrated at its worst in the following arrangement which Dr. Buttenwieser calls the "Original Order of Chapters 16 and 17 and their Constituent Parts from Chapters 29 and 30":

16.1-3; 17.10; 16.4-6; 29.2-6, 19-20, 18, 11, 7-10, 21-25; 30.9-10, 1; 16.10-11; 30.11; 16.7 and 1st word of 8; 17.7, 6; 16.8-9, 12-17; 17.8-9; 30.28b; 16.18-22; 17.3-5, 12; 30.26; 17.11; 30.22 = 17.1 a G; 17.1b-2; 30.24; 17.13-16.

It will be noted that in this long passage rarely more than four or

five verses are left in their 'original' order, as we are disposed to call it notwithstanding Dr. Buttenwieser's statement just quoted. Parts of chapter 16 are placed in chapter 17, and *vice versa*, and passages from 29 and 30 are added while a small part of 16-17 is omitted. One might almost think that this section, at least, of the Book of Job is a mosaic made up of single verses or brief passages which are so loosely connected that the critic can take them apart and put them together again in any order which seems to him to make the best sense out of the narrative. Surely the Book of Job must be indeed a masterpiece if in the "mutilated" form with which we are familiar it can be regarded as "one of the grandest things ever written with pen," and at the same time require such drastic revision to "restore" it to its original form.

This Commentary, if it can be called that, is a good illustration of the extremes to which Criticism logically tends. Were he desirous of doing so, Dr. Buttenwieser could doubtless find as good ground for rearranging any of the plays of Shakespeare or the writings of Dante or Milton. The great difficulty would be, of course, to convince others that the revision represented a real improvement. If the critic seriously proposes to re-write or re-arrange anything in literature which does not meet with his approval, he will have to be regarded as a literary vandal and the praise which he gives to the literary masterpiece which he proceeds to dissect and remodel, must be looked upon as merely an ill-disguised form of self-laudation, that he, the critic, is able to find flaws in so perfect a piece of literature and to improve upon it so greatly. We would like to be supplied with proof of the assertion, "without doubt the book was considered sacrilegious," which is the alleged justification of Dr. Buttenwieser's radical reconstruction. That Dr. Buttenwieser's re-arrangement of Job will receive acceptance, we do not fear. A book which has stood the test of so many centuries can hardly need re-writing at this late date. But this study is instructive as an illustration of the extremes to which destructive criticism is being carried.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

A History of Sinai. By LINA ECKENSTEIN, Author of "Woman under Monasticism." London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1921. Pp xiii, 202.

This little volume aims to give a connected history of Mount Sinai from the earliest times to the present. The author was a member of Professor Flinders Petrie's expedition in the winter of 1905-06, and had the rare privilege of being associated with him in his archæological investigations. She has made use of the best available sources, and especially of Professor Petrie's work *Researches in Sinai*. The view is advanced that Serabit, unknown to Europeans till the year 1760 when it was chanced upon by Carsten Niebuhr, was the site of the ancient sanctuary, known at the Mountain of the Lord. The writer describes in detail the historical and geographical problems which arise in the

different periods—the Semitic, the Egyptian, etc.—to modern times. The sketch is both interesting and informing.

Unfortunately Miss Eckenstein has adopted that naturalistic philosophy which regards the miraculous as impossible, and consequently as a feature in the history of Mount Sinai which the modern scholar must explain away. This appears especially in the chapters on the Israelites at Sinai, where the experiences of Israel are explained in a purely naturalistic way. Thus our author while quoting Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* as authority for the statement that "regarded as a history of ancient migrations of the Israelites and their establishment as a religious and political community in Canaan, the Hexateuch contains little more than a general outline on which to depend," goes on to state that "the study of the episode, reviewed in the light of modern research, reveals an unexpected accuracy, and once more shows that tradition is of value in proportion to our power of reading it aright." This would seem to indicate a conservative tendency. But, whatever else the words "our power of reading it aright" may mean, one thing is obvious, to admit any supernatural elements in the Exodus and desert wanderings of Israel would be 'to read it wrong.' Thus the mountain of God, to which Moses led the flock, was apparently an ancient sanctuary at Serabit, for many centuries a High Place of Burning, the centre of the worship of the Moon-god, and a shrine of the Semitic God Sopd. Yahwe is identified with this moon-god "in a later and more spiritualized aspect." The glory of the Lord referred to in Exodus xvi. 10, "probably indicates the moon." The manna was gathered from the tamarisk trees. So certain is our author of this that she sees in the references to manna confirmation of the contention, for which other evidence can be produced, that in ancient times there were many trees in the vicinity of Sinai. Thus, speaking of the station at Taberah, she tells us "Here manna was given plentifully (Num. xi. 8) which shows that the district was wooded." Obviously it is assumed as a fact that the manna was a purely natural product and that it came from the tamarisk.

David Hume contended that no amount of proof was sufficient to establish a miracle. The explanation which the higher critic of today gives of the miraculous events of the Old Testament suggests at times that any naturalistic explanation, however flimsy and preposterous, is to be preferred to the acceptance of the Biblical account. An illustration of this is found in the explanation given us of the Burning Bush. We are told, "The angel or messenger of God who spoke to Moses did so from a burning bush inside the Holy Ground (Exodus iii. 5). Perhaps he was set there as a guardian of the place. During our stay in Sinai, the guards who were appointed to watch over our encampment at Serabit, settled near some bushes to which they added brush-wood, so as to form a shelter, with an opening on one side. In this they spent their time, mostly sitting around a small fire. The appearance of the shelter from the outside was that of a burning bush

(Fig. 14)." Then we are shown a photograph of Arabs sitting around a fire. It does not require much consideration to convince ourselves of the inadequacy of this explanation. Moses had been living as a shepherd for many years in Midian, and might, therefore, be expected to be familiar with the customs of the Bedouin. If these brush-wood shelters, built around the fire looked so like burning bushes, it would be strange that Moses should say, "I will turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned." We would expect him to say, "There is another encampment of the Bedouin!" and to pay no further attention to it, unless perhaps to set a stricter watch over the sheep entrusted to him by Jethro his father-in-law. Instead of this, he turns aside and approaches the bush for closer inspection. Surely this closer inspection should reveal to him the nature of the burning bush, if it is really nothing more than a sheltered camp-fire; but clearly he is even more impressed with the uniqueness of the phenomenon and sees in it a manifestation of the presence of God. Besides this, the words "The ground on which thou standest is Holy Ground," are interpreted in an impossible way as referring to the fact that Moses stood within the confines of the Sanctuary, *i.e.*, on holy ground. Yet the narrative makes it plain that the reason the ground was holy, was simply because of the theophany.

It is unfortunate that a book which represents so much careful and painstaking research, and which is in itself so helpful a monograph should represent so biased and destructive a viewpoint when treating of the very events which make Mount Sinai of such unique interest to the Christian of today. For it is not the legend of St. Catherine, deeply as it impressed the mediæval mind, but the fact that at Mount Sinai God revealed himself to Moses and entered into Covenant relation with Israel and gave to them the Law, which makes Mount Sinai stand out as one of the great mountain peaks of human history.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

Kulturgeschichte Israels. Von ALFRED BERTHOLET, Professor der Theologie in Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1920. 8vo; pp. 294.

What we call "life" is a complex and many sided, a subtle and elusive thing. It is easy oft-times to describe in broad outline the characteristics and customs of a people, but an intimate knowledge may be hard, even impossible, to obtain. We may question the competence of the native writer or historian to give a true picture of his own people. We may assert that a contemporary document is partisan and lacks historic perspective. Yet the outsider with all his impartiality may be even less capable of seeing things in their true relations. And when that outsider is looking back upon the "life" which he describes through the mists of centuries he owes it to his readers to deal carefully and respectfully with the evidence upon which his history is largely and in some instances wholly dependent.

Professor Bertholet has given us in this volume a sketch of the "life" of Israel, or to be more exact of "life" in ancient Palestine, since about a quarter of the book deals with the land itself and with the customs of the Amorites and Canaanites who dwelt there before the days of Israel's entrance into it. Then follows a brief sketch of the Israelites at the time of the conquest and in the transition period. But the bulk of the book is devoted to a description of the civilization of Israel in Palestine: the home and family life, the business, social and political life, the "spiritual" life under which such subjects as law, science, art, and religion are considered.

That Professor Bertholet is writing from the standpoint of the dominant school of criticism, and that he belongs to the radical wing of that school might be inferred from the fact that he dedicates the volume to his former teacher Dr. Bernhard Duhm; and the correctness of the surmise is conclusively proved by the manner of treatment. After discussing the evidence which archaeology has rendered available for the pre-Mosaic period, our author passes on to consider as has been stated the culture of the Israelitish immigrants. There are, he tells us, three sources available; the OT records, the literary remains of the ancient Arabs and other neighboring tribes, and our knowledge of the life of the Bedouin of today. Regarding as he does the OT records dealing with the Mosaic period as late and unreliable, he naturally seeks most of his facts from these other sources. It is largely from them that he draws the evidence for his reconstruction of the culture of the Israel of the conquest in so far as it is not to be regarded as purely conjectural. Thus he adopts the common view that the family life of early Israel must have been matriarchal, because modern scholars, notably Robertson Smith have shown that this was true at least to some extent of the Bedouin. He finds traces of such a system in early Israel in the instances of the naming of children by the mother, the mention of Sarah's tent, etc.; and accounts for the fact that the narratives as a whole are so strongly and unmistakably patriarchal as due to their late date. He does not consider the question whether the ancient Arabic accounts which date from a period some two thousand years later than the time of Moses can properly be regarded as true to the life of the earlier period. Nor does he reckon with the fact that the ancestors of Israel though Arameans are definitely said to have come from Babylonia, and that the Code of Hammurabi, some of the provisions of which were undoubtedly operative not merely in Babylonia but also in Palestine, reveals to us a civilization no less patriarchal than that described in the Book of Genesis. It is not as an archaeologist but as an evolutionist that the critic is desirous of establishing a primitive matriarchy.

Professor Bertholet rejects the clear teaching of the Pentateuch that bloody sacrifice was piacular, and asserts that it was originally designed to establish or strengthen blood relationship with the tribal god.

He tells us that the religion of the pre-Mosaic period was Polydemonism and that the "new and enduring" element in Moses' teaching consisted in this, that he "freed the old Sinai-god from his physical (naturnhaften) limitations" in order to connect him with the developing national life of Israel; in which connection he tells us "lies the real seed of the unique religious development of Israel." He connects Prophetism with such ecstatic phenomena as are observed today in the case of the dancing dervishes. "The Nabi is an ecstatic, and his make-up is more suggestive of a crazy or mad man than of one who is normal mentally. States of wild phrenzy come upon him, so that he is 'changed to another man,'—but not in the sense of moral regeneration: sometimes he strips off his clothes and for a considerable time lies naked or half-naked." It is from such unworthy beginnings that the critic evolves that unique phenomenon, OT. prophecy. In the introduction of the Deuteronomic Code in the 7th city, we have, he thinks, a great advance step in the religion of Israel, which until the time of the Assyrian period did not differ very greatly from the religions of the neighboring peoples, the Moabites, with their god Chemosh, the Ammonites with their god Milcom.

As an illustration of the liberties which Professor Bertholet takes with the OT narratives the following may be cited. Speaking of the bitter herbs with which the passover lamb was to be eaten he says: "That these are to call to mind the bitter suffering of Israel in Egypt, as the later Rabbis insist, is one of those typical historical explanations which are wont to arise, when the original meaning of a custom is no longer understood. The bitter herbs may at one time have been a means of protection, to defend them against the evil spirits." Why the learned professor feels obliged to reject the simple and natural explanation given us in the OT narrative (why refer it to the later Rabbis?) he does not tell us. The critics are constantly on the look out for some esoteric meaning which they can use to support their reconstruction of the religion and history of Israel. Whether this meaning has to read into it, or whether it flatly contradicts it, is a secondary consideration.

The critics are accustomed to speak of those who adhere to the old views of the Scriptures as traditionalists. But every now and again we find statements in their writings which indicate that their theory has become so traditional with them that they have forgotten that there is another side, a side which represents the historic faith of the Church throughout the ages. Bertholet cites a statement of Gunkel to the effect that in modern literature we have to do in the main with great individual poets or writers, as a result of which the modern history of literature must at its highest points especially assume the character of biography, while in the literary history of Israel the single individual plays a much more minor role. That Gunkel could make this statement and Bertholet accept it shows how singularly oblivious they are of the fact that there is, as we have said, another side. For when we read the OT as it is and not as the critics have reconstructed it for us, one of the

things which stands out most prominently is the fact that the history of Israel is to an almost unparalleled degree the history, the biography if you will, of a comparatively few men. Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc.—take them out of the life of Israel, take the historical and legal and poetical and prophetic writings attributed to them out of the OT record and a very large part of the OT is gone. Hehn in his *Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee* calls attention to this remarkable fact as distinguishing the religion of Israel clearly from that of the neighboring peoples. The critics have been endeavoring for years to dissect these great epoch-making and epoch-marking figures of Israel's history into a multitude of "unknowns." Thus the very fact that about half of the Psalms are attributed by the titles to David is cited by the critics as rendering these titles suspicious right from the start. That the critics should do their utmost to eliminate this striking feature of Israel's history and religion, its great heroic figures, its God-commissioned leaders and teachers, and then point to the absence of such outstanding personalities as a significant difference between the past and the present, illustrates very clearly how fully persuaded they are of the truth of their hypothesis.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

The Ship "Tyre," A Study in the Commerce of the Bible. By WILFRED H. SCHOFF, Secretary of the Commercial Museum, Philadelphia. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. 1920. Pp. 156. \$2.00 net.

The prophecies of Ezekiel and Isaiah concerning the ship "Tyre," the King of Tyre and the commerce associated with the Phoenicians are interpreted in this book as cryptic messages; comforting to the oppressed, assuring them of the fate that awaits the conqueror in all ages. The list of commercial products, especially in the 27th and 28th chapters of Ezekiel, represents the materials in the temple and palace at Jerusalem carried to Babylon, the ship is a symbol of Babylon, and the King of Tyre is a cryptonym for the King of Babylon. The symbolism of the Book of Revelation is treated in the same manner.

The book is the result of laborious compilation and gives much helpful information concerning the commerce of that time. The author shows a first-hand knowledge of much of the Jewish traditions concerning the interpretations of the prophetic books in question.

However, the object set forth must remain a theory for which very little convincing argument has been produced by the author. Emendations are freely suggested for the text to make the prophecy agree with the theory. The theory itself is an interesting one; but it is presented in rather a dull, laborious style, through much repetition, and in paragraphs and chapters with no discernible sequence; and if one had not read the fore-word it is doubtful if he would finish the book with a clear notion of what the author intended to prove.

May's Landing, N. J.

CHARLES F. DEININGER.

Die Schriften des Alten Testaments. 3. Abteilung: *Lyrik und Weissheit.*

I. *Lyrick (Psalmen, Hoheslied und Verwandtes)* übersetzt, erklärt und mit Einleitungen versehen. Von D. DR. W. STAERK, Professor an der Universität Jena. 8 vo. Pp. 306. II. *Hiob und Weisheit (Das Buch Hiob, Sprüche und Jesus Sirach, Prediger)* übersetzt, erklärt und mit Einleitungen versehen. Von D. PAUL VOLZ. 8 vo. Pp. 270. 2. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1920-21.

Professor Staerk tells us in his preface that the principles laid down by the editors of this series of commentaries have been observed in all essential points in the preparation of the second edition of his Commentary. His viewpoint might not inaptly be described as that of a higher critic who has a special interest in metrics. He accepts the general conclusions of the Wellhausen school as to the date of the Psalms. While ready to admit that many of them (the royal psalms, many hymns, Ps. 24 and still others) are preexilic, he rejects the testimony of the titles utterly and does not even regard the 18th Psalm as Davidic. He treats the text of the Psalms with much freedom, and frequently either alters the reading or states that it is suspicious or corrupt. In some instances certainly and probably in many his reason for doing this is to be found in his theory of metrics.

In his treatment of the text of Job, Professor Volz is quite radical. He frequently changes the order of verses in a chapter or inserts verses from another chapter. Thus in chapter vii. the order of verses is: 1-7, 16, 9-11, 15, 13, 14, 17-19, 12, 20, 21; chapter xxiii. is inserted, with certain minor changes and omissions, between chaps. vi. and vii; part of chap. xxv. with all of chap. xxvi. (vs. 1-4 follow vss. 5-14) is similarly placed between chaps. xiii and ix. It is interesting to compare his "original" with that of Professor Buttenwieser (see above). Thus, while Buttenwieser begins his radical reconstruction with chap. xvi, Volz begins with chap. vi and while B. makes 'mincemeat' of chap. xvi, V. makes relatively few changes in it. It looks as if the critics would be rather slow in reaching a 'scholarly consensus' regarding this Book. The special feature about Professor Volz's treatment of Proverbs is that the verses are arranged topically and are grouped with passages from Ecclesiasticus which deal with the same subject matter. As regards Ecclesiastes he is of the opinion that it was probably written in Alexandria about 200 B.C. by a wise man who wrote it primarily for himself and for his 'pupil'.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Matt. 11,27 (Luc. 10, 22) Eine Kritisch-Exegetische Untersuchung. Von DR. HEINRICH SCHUMACHER. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche Verlagshandlung (St. Louis, Mo.) 1912, 8vo. Ss. xviii, 225.

After discarding the fourth gospel as unhistorical the critics still faced Matt. 11, 27 (Lk. 10, 22), the one admittedly "Johannine" passage in the

synoptics. It was subjected to a violent attack primarily from a textual critical, but also from an exegetical viewpoint. Does the idea "Son of God" as occurring here merely denote a moral relation toward God, or a filiation through participation in Jahweh's essence? The solution of this problem has an important bearing upon the question whether the divinity of Christ, as taught in the Johannine Gospel, is a fiction of later Christianity, or whether the Christology of the church is but an elaboration of the Synoptic-Johannine doctrine, reaching its climax in the words, "I and the Father are one." The problem this book contemplates is therefore, of the utmost importance; and the author aims to present the first exhaustive investigation of it from the Roman side. (pp. 1-5.)

As the reviewer agrees with the tenor and contents of the volume he may perhaps serve the reader best by giving a brief outline of the book. Chapter I, "On the History of the Problem" (pp. 6-18) shows how the passage was debated in the second century, as regards both text and meaning. But, although the matter was then settled, with the rise of Rationalism both the textual critical and the exegetical questions have not only been restated, but the problem shifted, and the points of debate increased.

With untiring patience and scholarly perseverance, Dr. Schumacher investigates in Chapter II, (pp. 19-100) the evidence concerning the text, reaching the conclusion, "If there be any word at all in the gospel which we have to honor without question as a real, unfalsified word of Jesus, it is the shout of joy in Matt. 11, 27 (Lk. 10, 22)." Every phase of the problem is thoroughly investigated, and this fully warranted conclusion is attained by a process of strictly logical reasoning. While Chapter III speaks briefly of the "Historic connection of the passage and its import for the exegesis" (101-108) the bulk of the second part of the treatise is contained in Chapter IV which gives the exegesis by taking up and discussing in detail the words, 1. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the son"; 2. "and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him"; 3. the introductory words, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father." All of this points to the metaphysical Sonship of Jesus. A fifth Chapter reaches the same conclusions by comparing the result thus obtained with four other Synoptic Passages, while Chapter VI defends the conclusion of the author against four different modern theories of the Sonship of Christ.

The heading on p. 153 where Jesus is called "a revealer standing over against (*gegenüberstehender*) the Father with similar absolute independence (*Selbstständigkeit*)" we deem unfortunate, Jesus being dependent upon the Father as a revealer. But it is well meant, as is evident from the contents of the paragraph itself, as well as from the next heading, where He is called "the exclusive mediator of revelation of the Father."

The book is thorough and it is sound. To read it will delight not only

the orthodox, but all who enjoy a fair and scholarly study of historical and internal evidence. A commendable feature is that the author, although a Romanist, has not only read early patristic, Romish, and critical literature, but also frequently quotes approvingly from orthodox Protestant commentators. The entire exegetical investigation of Chapter IV is even concluded with a "word of the positive Protestant theologian Lemme" (p. 178).

Hammond, Ind.

J. K. VAN BAALEN.

Christus in seiner Präexistenz und Kenose nach Phil. 2, 5-8. 2 Teil: Exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung. VON HEINRICH SCHUMACHER, Assoc. Prof. d. Neutl. Exegese a. d. Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. Rom. Papstl. Bibel-Institut. 1921. 8vo. Ss. xv, 423.

Dr. Schumacher, who since the publication of his study on Matt. 11, 27 has moved from Landau (Rheinpfalz) to Washington, D. C., has rendered the cause of orthodox Christianity an important service with the publication of his latest work. The book is written in a lucid style, its arguments are clear, its citations well chosen and taken from a vast range of literature. It consists of two chapters, the first of which deals with the text, the second with the exegesis, of this famous passage, "the most valuable compendium of Pauline Christology" (p. 391). The method is similar to that followed in the study of Matt. 11, 27. But here the difficulties are less of a textual-critical nature, there being little question that the text has come down to us correctly. The second chapter is necessarily a long one (pp. 62-397) because, as Ellicott has said, "In this important, and it is to be feared much perverted passage, nearly every word has formed the subject of controversy" (p. 95). The value of this study lies not so much in the fact that the opinion of many commentators is given so fully as to render it unnecessary to consult them, as far at least as this classic text is concerned, as because the author arrives at his conclusions as a result of an investigation of the literary evidence regarding the meaning which the words employed by Paul carried in his time and to the people addressed. Thus the meaning of *μορφή* is traced in its development from Homer to Aristotle with the result that with the latter it is found to be synonymous with *θεός*, *οὐσία* and *ἐνέργεια* (p. 191). The author then raises the question whether the contemporaries of Paul used the word in the same sense—"the essence of God as the cause of beginning and end of all things." And this is answered in the affirmative not only of Plutarch, but also of the hellenistic, though orthodox Jew Philo "who might be called upon as a dependable aid in many a riddle of the Pauline literature," and of Flavius Josephus. The signification of *ἀρπαγμός* is likewise traced from Homer to Paul. To this is added the testimony of Latin and Greek patristic literature, said to be of the utmost importance because: 1. The early ecclesiastical writers naturally would understand the language of Paul better than did later authors since they were nearer to the time of the apostle; 2. Greek

fathers would be better judges of Greek language than the best modern lexicographer; and 3. They all understand and quote the text in the same way. (p. 272).

The above are only samples of the method of Dr. Schumacher's work. We believe he reaches the right conclusion as to the correct exegesis of the passage. We also agree with his view of the *kenosis*. The book closes with a comparison of the writer's conclusions regarding this passage with the Christology of other Pauline passages, and of the synoptic and Johannine Christology.

Hammond, Ind.

J. K. VAN BAALEN.

SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY

What Shall I Believe? A Primer of Christian Theology. By AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG, D.D., LL.D., LITT. D., Late President Emeritus of Rochester Theological Seminary. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, London and Edinburgh. 1922. Pp. 118.

This little Primer of theology, posthumously published, is the "val-edictory," as Mr. J. H. Strong calls it in the Introduction, of the veteran theologian of the Baptists. It is an attempt to put into a more popular and condensed form than in his *Systematic Theology*, the "salient points of Christian doctrine," as the author states in the Preface.

What we have here, then, is a condensed and popular statement of the late Dr. Strong's theology. Because of his importance as a theologian, this Primer is important.

Dr. Strong's theological position, as set forth in his larger work of three volumes, and the smaller one of one volume, is well known (see the review of his larger work in this Review). It is Augustinianism combined with idealistic monism. It is our opinion, as before expressed in the review just mentioned, that monism and Augustinianism do not combine very well. We think that Dr. Strong maintained his firm evangelicalism because of his deep religious and Christian experience and his endeavour to be loyal to the Scriptures, and in spite of rather than because of his philosophy. We do not think that the Scripture teaches that "matter is Christ's self-limitation under the law of necessity," or that "humanity is Christ's self-limitation under the law of freedom" (p. 25). We can agree with Dr. Strong that monism may be either theistic or pantheistic, but we find it easier to conceive on a pantheistic rather than on a theistic basis. No one, however, in our opinion, has excelled Dr. Strong in the attempt to work out and state clearly a theistic monism and to combine it with evangelical Christian truth. Would that all idealistic monists were like Dr. Strong.

His work is done, and it was a great work. We do not wish to conclude this notice of his last work by pointing out our dissent from his philosophy, but rather take pleasure in referring to the greatness of

his theological work and especially of his loyalty to Christ. In the Introduction we are told that he wished only two words on his tombstone: "For me to live is Christ," and "I have kept the faith." This is an appropriate epitaph for the leading theologian of the American Baptists.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

Christian Dogmatics and Notes on the History of Dogma. By CONRAD EMIL LINDBERG, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology. Translation from the Swedish by Rev. C. E. Hoffstein, B.D. Revised and augmented by the author. Rock Island, Ill. Augustana Book Concern. 1922. Pp. 602.

This text book of Christian dogmatics was published in Swedish in 1898. It is now given to the public and especially to the author's students in our English translation.

It is a system of Christian doctrine from the point of view of Confessional Lutheranism. Dr. Lindberg makes frequent use of the best Lutheran sources such as the theological works of Baier, Hollaz, Quenstedt, and Gerhard. He makes use also of modern Lutheran dogmatics such as those of Luthardt and Schmid. His treatment, however, is independent. He has thought out the subject for himself and given his own statement of orthodox Lutheranism. He makes use of all the scholastic theological distinctions, and the result is a somewhat scholastic presentation of Lutheran theology.

Dr. Lindberg discusses the views of Schleiermacher, but there is no discussion of any of the theological movements since the time of Schleiermacher, with the exception of a few brief references to Ritschl.

The work is designed as a text book for students in the Augustana Seminary, and should prove an admirable compend of Lutheran dogmatics for all theological Seminaries of the Lutheran Church.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

Modernism in Religion. By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Litt. D., Emeritus Professor in the George Washington University: Founder and now Associate Rector of All Souls' Memorial Church, Washington, D. C. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1922. Pp. 186.

The author of this book is well known for his writings on Hegel's philosophy. In this volume he makes a personal confession of his religious beliefs. The old and the new, he says, form an organic process. Modernists in the true sense, he thinks, do not exalt any one stage, be it old or new, to the exclusion of all the others. They build on the past, but seek to state old truths in forms that the modern mind can accept. In this attempt Dr. Sterrett is somewhat of a free lance in his modernism. Abbe Loisy goes too far for him, and he prefers Father Tyrrell.

Probably the strictly modern mind, if one may speak of such an abstraction, would find Dr. Sterrett's modernism too conservative. In fact he seems at times governed by aesthetic and emotional reactions in retaining more of historic Christianity than would a strictly up to date modernist. The believer in the supernatural and final character

of the Christian revelation, on the other hand, will feel that there is too much of the author's philosophy and too little of historical Christianity.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

Our Reasonable Faith. By PARK HAYS MILLER. The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work, Philadelphia. 1922. Pp. 222.

This little volume does not deal with Apologetics. It does not enter into any discussion of the question of the reasonableness of Christian faith, as the title would seem to indicate.

It is a brief and popular statement of Christian doctrine and ethics.

Part first deals with a Christian's book, "the Bible." The author points out the uniqueness of the Bible, states briefly how it was written and preserved, and gives a brief account of the English versions.

Part second is an admirable summary of Christian doctrine, taking up in successive chapters God, Christ, The Holy Spirit, Sin and Salvation. Part third, entitled "The Christian's Life Principles," gives an excellent summary of the teaching of the Ten Commandments. Part fourth is on "The Christian Institution," the Church, and outlines the doctrine of the Christian Church.

The treatment is too brief and elementary to serve as a text book for students of theology. This is not the author's purpose. But for popular use it is admirable. It is some time since we have read so good a summary of Christian doctrine.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Public Opinion and Theology. By FRANCIS JOHN McCONNELL, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Abingdon Press. 1920. Pp. 259.

This volume contains the Earl Lectures of the Pacific School of Religion, 1920. An interesting theme is treated in an interesting way. The subject is divided into two parts: 1—Some Real Gains. This includes seven chapters: Introductory, The Divine Responsibility, Responsible to Whom? God and Man and the Daily Task, Publicity in the Kingdom of God, The Divine Friendship, Provision for Rescue. 2—Some Steadying Factors. Here there are five chapters: The Individual, The Church and Society, The Book of Rebellion and Freedom, Jesus, the Christlike God. Whether the discussion elicits agreement or provokes dissent, it is always of interest, and the treatment in general is sane and sober. The thought is not pushed to extremes, but is judicious and well balanced. Great stress is laid upon God's responsibility to man as his Creator, but it is not shown how this may be reconciled with Paul's doctrine of Grace. If God is bound to do all He can for the sinner, in what sense

is salvation of grace alone? This question the author does not attempt to answer, yet it lies at the heart of the whole matter.

And again we ask, if it is true that "Whatever the form of punishment that God metes out to men, the punishment must aim at their enlargement and improvement" (p. 133), how can we believe that "In the presence of the fateful weight of human freedom we must not say that every soul will ultimately be saved" (p. 131), unless indeed we regard hell as simply an endless experiment?

On p. 113 we read of "the book of the Hebrews," meaning not the Old Testament, as we might surmise, but the Epistle.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Intention of His Soul: Essays for the Untheologically minded. By HUBERT L. SIMPSON. Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. xv-260. \$2.00 net.

This is a volume of marked interest, and we are not surprised that it has reached its third edition. The essays are original, stimulating, suggestive. The titles are striking, and new light is thrown upon familiar texts. There are pregnant sentences, which may readily be developed into sermons. Historical occurrences yield spiritual lessons in a simple natural way.

In commenting on God's word to Moses, "I am," the author says, "One might well hesitate to handle this verse because of its sheer sublimity. Two words! Three letters! and *we* need thirty-nine articles, and thirty-three chapters of a Confession, and Fourteen Points, and I know not what all. And a precious lot of good they have all done us!" (p. 137). Compare with this the words found on p. 248: "We seem to be agreed that the old religious regime of our fathers is altogether too Spartan for the present day—the old fashioned Sunday, the long sermons, the Shorter Catechism and the rest. It was a desperately severe training, but look at the kind of men it produced! Look at the souls they grew in those days!"

Faith is represented as taking a chance, and the element of certainty and assurance is ignored. Religion is essentially making a bargain with God. "No man can be dead sure of God beforehand. Religion is a big venture, but seeing a man has got to take risks anyway it is worth while betting on the love of God in Christ. If you ask for definite guarantees, you are simply betraying an unhealthy and unsportsmanslike craving which is gratified in no other venture of life's experience. The Holy Spirit loves a man who will take a sporting chance as truly as you would love him yourself" (p. 175). Happily this rather sordid view of religion does not appear elsewhere in the volume, or it would be far less interesting and helpful than it is. There is frequent reference to the war and to the political and social conditions of the time, and Christ is presented as the only Savior of a sinsick world. The 13th paper it entitled, *Sensation or Sacrifice?* and is based upon two texts—*Cast thyself down, and, Come down from the Cross.* "You can always tell these rose-water religions by the place they give to the Cross, or rather the place they refuse to give it. . . . 'We preach Christ crucified,'

and unless we are going to do that we had better go out and tout for some harmless patent medicine" (pp. 128-129).

Preachers will find the book stimulating and helpful to an unusual degree.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Eyes of Faith. By LYNN HAROLD HOUGH. Abingdon Press. 1920. Pp. 223.

This is an interesting and instructive volume. Themes of the first importance are discussed with understanding, sympathy, and stimulating power. With catholic spirit and real insight the author enters into the experiences of men as different as Paul and Augustine and Luther and Wesley. The style is clear and strong, sometimes brilliant. Christ is honored and exalted. "The secrets of the world are all at Calvary" (p. 218). Emphasis is laid upon the work of the Holy Spirit. It is a good book to clarify and confirm the faith of believers, and to open the mind and touch the heart of those who have not yet learned the secret and the peace of faith.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Religion of a Layman. By CHARLES R. BROWN, Dean of the Divinity School, Yale University. The Macmillan Co. 1920. Pp. vii. -84. \$1.25.

The book is not a commentary, the author tells us, but an interpretation. It undertakes to explain the Sermon on the Mount in the language and apply it to the conditions of today. The work is well done. The thought is clear and strong, with a firm grasp on essential truth, and is presented in a fresh and striking way, adapted to awaken interest and carry the truth home to the conscience and the heart. Again we are called to wonder why preachers cling to the authorized version with the more accurate rendering of the Revised Version at hand. On p. 23 we read, "It was said by them of old time, Thou Shalt Not Kill."

There is an unconvincing reference to Jesus' sense of humor (p. 36). That he possessed it as a normal man is, of course, true. But the examples of humor that are sometimes adduced from the Gospels do not exhibit it.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Ambassadors of God. By S. PARKES CADMAN. The Macmillan Co. 1920. Pp. 353.

One of the foremost preachers of our time gives us in this volume the results of his study, observation, and experience. The titles of the several chapters indicate the course of thought: The Scriptural Basis for Preaching; Prophets and Preachers of the Christian Church; The Modern Attitude Toward Preaching; Cross Currents Which Affect Preaching; Present Day Intellectualism and Preaching; The Nature and Ideals of the Christian Ministry; Preaching, Its Preparation and

Practice; Preaching, Its Preparation and Practice (continued); Preaching and Worship. A Bibliography and an Index are added.

The thought is well conceived and presented. The judgments expressed and counsels given are in general sound and wholesome. The style is strong and attractive, though here too, as so often in the work of the preachers of today, we crave greater simplicity of speech, less apparent effort to be striking and effective. We are often moved to wish that the author had given heed to his own wise advice, "Avoid superfluous ornamentation" (p. 298). And we feel that what he says of Bergson might be applied to himself: "His genius for expression is at times seductive of his thought and embarrassing to the flow of his argument" (p. 181).

The treatment of the theme is vigorous, suggestive, helpful. Principles are discussed rather than methods. If we should undertake to compare this volume with Principal Garvie's *The Christian Preacher*, we might say that Dr. Cadman is more inspiring than instructive, and Dr. Garvie is more instructive than inspiring.

The advice is given, "Study Wesley as you study no other modern preacher" (p. 67). "The seven American clergymen whose preeminent service swept beyond sectarian boundaries were Lyman Beecher, William Ellery Channing, Horace Bushnell, Charles G. Finney, Matthew Simpson, Henry Ward Beecher, and Phillips Brooks" (p. 77). This list perhaps will win as general acceptance as any that could be framed. "The imperial intellect of Calvin made the ancient prophets audible to the Protestant world, and their social and political influence upon Northern Europe and America can be traced to the massive erudition and admirable exegetical methods which his commentaries display" (p. 23). After speaking of earlier leaders of the Church, Dr. Cadman remarks that "none of these reformers had the conceptual strength which enabled Calvin to lay the granitic foundations of intellectual Protestantism" (p. 59). These extracts illustrate the author's Catholicity of spirit and general soundness of judgment.

That Jesus "revolutionized" the Old Testament. "giving it an entirely new direction and fulfilment in Himself" (p. 29), is contrary to his own teaching and to that of the New Testament in general. He did not give it new direction, but fulfilled its types and promises and prophecies, as their predestined goal.

On page 27 we read of "a vast arcana."

The spirit of the book is devout, earnest, reverent, sincere. Christ is everywhere recognized as Savior and Lord, and the Church as his body, his witness, his minister.

Our review may fitly close with these words of wisdom: "I venture to break a lance with those who contend that the advocacy of social righteousness should be the absorbing theme of your ministry. When everything has been said, the fact remains that the restitution of the entire man after the pattern of his Creator is the whole of which social righteousness is but a part" (p. 122).

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Wonderful Christ. By REV. ALBERT PLEASANT ROBINSON, author of "One Pearl, and Other Sermons." Glad Tidings Publishing Co. Pp. 54. Price, 35 cents.

That Christ is wonderful is shown by the "Concurrent Testimony of Bible Characters" and by "Divine Attestations." He is wonderful in his creation, in his birth, in his ministry, in his graces, in his second coming, in his eternal glory. The thought presented is in general in line with Scripture teaching, and renders to Christ the honor that is his due as Savior and Lord.

The style leaves much to be desired. It lacks precision and grace, and does not always observe the rules of grammar. There is a profuse, even excessive, use of Scripture quotations.

Various inaccuracies appear. It was not Malchus (p. 11) but a kinsman of Malchus who accused Peter of being a disciple of Jesus (John xviii. 26). Paul is represented as the author of the *book* of Hebrews (p. 15). A noted preacher of the last generation is introduced as "the right Rev. T. D. Talmadge" (p. 24). Surely it is time that preachers should omit 1 John v. 7 from their list of prooftexts (p. 21). It is curiously at variance with the Scripture narrative of the resurrection to say that because of the prediction of Jesus "the hearts and minds of his disciples and friends were fully prepared" (p. 40). "Slammed the rocks into Stephen's ribs" occurs on p. 14.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princes of the Church. By W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, LL.D. George H. Doran Company, New York.

This volume is a collection of biographical sketches of notable figures in the Churches of England and Scotland. The sketches were written by the editor of the *British Weekly* and appeared from time to time in its pages. American writers and speakers are the ones who above all others have been charged with a fondness for the adjective 'great,' and for too strong a predilection for the superlative mood. But now we must hand our crown over to Dr. Nicoll and his fellow writers on the other side of the Atlantic. It matters not whom Dr. Nicoll writes about, be he professor, ecclesiastic, preacher, student, orator, or saint, he is always great and preeminent. Of Dr. Parker he says that "to set down one's memory of his sentences would only be to mar them"; George Matheson was "potentially the greatest man given to the Scottish Churches since the days of Dr. Chalmers"; "If Dr. Rainy had been a member of the House of Commons he would most certainly have been the first man there"; of Ian MacLaren he says. "Since George MacDonald, there has been no such prophet of immortality"; Marcus Dods was "one of the few who really loved God"; "in any profession Alexander MacLaren would have taken the head." The sketches are marred by this unrestrained eulogy, and no doubt if Dr. Nicoll were writing of these men today, he would write more guardedly of their eloquence, scholarship and saintliness, for in their characters and lives there must

have been some modicum of this world which presses so hard upon us all, even upon Scottish preachers and theologians.

Aside from this very serious defect, the book is admirable and all who love biography will rejoice in it. Ministers especially will find much that is profitable and suggestive in these accounts of the celebrated personages of the British Churches. In the sketch of Professor Flint, for example, it will be stimulating for ministers to read a sentence like this: "It was their extraordinary learning that singled out Flint and Fairbairn from their contemporaries. Both had manifold gifts of speech, of intellectual energy, of religious devotion. But it was their supremacy in knowledge that impressed men's minds. They spent long hours and lonely hours of study in comparative obscurity, but once they had accomplished their tasks and displayed their resources the most jealously locked doors fell open."

One of the most interesting accounts is that of Cardinal Vaughan. His mother never asked a temporal blessing for any of her children, but prayed that they might all be devoted to the Church. Of her eight sons six became priests and her five daughters entered convents. "It is strange and painful to read that during his last years he wore on his left arm an iron bracelet, with spikes on the inside, which were pressed into the flesh. It was made out of steel wire, and the points were sharp. When it was made to his satisfaction, he told a friend to bring a pair of pliers and to fasten it on the arm so that it could never come off. When that was done, the Cardinal brought his right hand down heavily on the iron circlet and so drove it home. It was cut off his arm after death." However much we may disapprove of this mortification of the flesh, this driving in of a not God-given thorn, the Protestant Church would do well to emphasize the truth of which that spiked bracelet was but the symbol, namely, that the prizes of the Christian life must be won with a struggle, that we must make war on the flesh, that we must strive, literally, agonize, to enter in at the strait gate. In the words of Froude in his life of Bunyan, "We live in days of progress and enlightenment; nature on a hundred sides has unlocked her storehouses of knowledge. But she has furnished no 'open sesame' to bid the mountain gate fly wide which leads to conquest of self. There is still no passage there for 'body and soul and sin.'"

Philadelphia, Pa.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY.

Lord, Teach Us to Pray. Sermons on Prayer by the late REV. PRINCIPAL ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D., LL.D. George H. Doran Company, New York.

This is a great book on a great subject written by a prophet, who knows from his own experience what prayer means. Many of the devotional books of our time are compilations, whose authorship reveals a wide and industrious gleaning. As such they are interesting and informing, but they fatally lack the element of inspiration. Principal Whyte has read as few men have the classical literature on the ministry of intercession, and his sermons abound with apt and illuminating

quotations, but the deep spiritual meaning of prayer he has verified in a long and rich religious experience, and he gives to us the ripe teaching of a saint who has himself learned how to pray. Principal Whyte is not only a man of prayer, but his preaching on this great theme is specifically Christian. Some of our prayer manuals are so vague and general, and so lacking in evangelical fervor that a Hebrew, a Mohammedan or a Hindoo might use them without any offence to his non-Christian convictions. These sermons on prayer are saturated with the redemptive passion of the Christian Gospel. They do not contemplate man as a highly developed organism in process of spiritual evolution, needing enlightenment and encouragement, and who derives a large amount of subjective profit from the psychological discipline of prayer. No,—man is a fallen creature conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, prone to evil as the sparks are to fly upward, who needs a Saviour,

"He, who for men their Surety stood,
And poured on earth His precious blood,"

who needs the ever living intercession of a great High Priest, and who receives spiritual comfort, strength and guidance from the throne of grace, not only for himself, but for all who are included in his intercession. Principal Whyte's preaching on prayer is Biblical, evangelical, experimental, and it gives to prayer its preeminent place in the Christian ministry. These twenty-three selected sermons are only a few of those preached in the pulpit of Free St. Georges in the later years of Dr. Whyte's ministry on a single text, "Luke eleven one." They exhibit his favorite theme, and indicate his conviction as to the essential qualification for effective preaching. Like the disciples themselves, he approached the Master, not with the request for gifts of persuasion, for ability to perform wonders, but for power in prayer. This testimony by one of the greatest preachers of our day as to the place of prayer in the Christian life and in the work of the ministry is a timely message from which the laity as well as the clergy will derive large spiritual profit.

Princeton.

J. ROSS STEVENSON.

The Psychology of Adolescence. By FREDERICK TRACY, Ph.D. New York The Macmillan Co. 1920. Pp. x, 246. \$3.00.

The New Program of Religious Education. By GEORGE HERBERT BETTS. The Abingdon Press. New York. 1921. Pp. 107. \$.75 net.

The Meaning of Education. By JAMES H. SNOWDEN. The Abingdon Press. New York. 1921. Pp. 122. \$.75 net.

The Bible in Graded Story. By EDNA DEAN BAKER AND CLARA BELLE BAKER. The Abingdon Press. New York. 1921. Volume One. The Good Shepherd. Pp. 83. \$.75 net. Volume Two. The Good Neighbor. Pp. 136. \$1.00 net.

The Mother Teacher of Religion. By ANNA FREELove BETTS. The Abingdon Press. New York. 1922. Pp. 290. \$2.00 net.

Organization and Administration of Religious Education. By JOHN ELBERT STOUT. The Abingdon Press. New York. 1922. Pp. 287. \$1.50 net.

Education for Successful Living. By JAMES E. CLARKE. Philadelphia. The Westminster Press. 1922. Pp. 152. \$1.00.

These volumes represent a selection from the numerous publications on Religious Education now appearing, and from them we may inform ourselves concerning the present trend of opinion on this important topic. Professor Tracy's book is one of the Handbooks of Moral and Religious Education, a series edited by Dr. E. Hershey Sneath, Professor of Religious Education in Yale University. The aim of the book is not investigation but survey. It gathers what is known concerning the mental life of the *average* youth and maiden, and makes it available for the *average* teacher. In successive chapters it treats of Instinct and Habit, Emotion, Intellect, Will, Self-Consciousness, Sex, the Aesthetic, Moral, and Religious Life, and concludes with a chapter on the Pedagogy of Adolescence. At the end of the book is a Bibliography complete enough for an exhaustive study of the subject treated. No book at present published surpasses this volume in comprehensiveness of presentation and in giving attractively and soberly the facts of adolescence accepted by the majority of investigators.

Professor Betts defines for us the aims of religious education and its place in the activity of the church. He thinks that the church is losing prestige and is failing to attract members, because 56 per cent of our population are not members of any church whatsoever, and 27,000,000 children and youth in the United States are not receiving any religious instruction and have no religious interests. There is also an increasing ignorance of the Bible and of the Christian religion among all classes of our people. To meet this situation two activities are urged: Religious Education and Evangelism. Professor Betts gives his estimate of each, and then, because, in his opinion, the widespread indifference or hostility to religious education is due to failure fully to understand its meaning, he devotes the rest of the book to an exposition of its meaning and method. To our mind the antithesis of Religious Education and Evangelism is overdrawn, but we think that he emphasizes a needed truth in asserting that one of the prime responsibilities of the church is the religious education of its children and youth.

Dr. Snowden's little volume on education is a stimulating synthesis of well approved and generally accepted views as to the ideals of Christian education. It is written in his usual crisp and vivid style and should prove just the book to put into the hands of Sabbath School Teachers generally, inasmuch as it gives in brief form the information needed concerning aims and methods.

One of the most exquisite and useful of all arts is that of teaching little children the truths contained in the Scripture. The genius in this field is doubtless as elsewhere born, not made; therefore the books by Edna Dean Baker and Clara Belle Baker, and by Anna Freelove

Betts will not interest the geniuses who know already, but for the majority of us who prayerfully and humbly are eager to learn how best to lead the little children to Christ, these volumes are full of instruction. They give models of effective presentation of Bible Stories; they point out the things to be emphasized; they are full of wholesome admonition; and they can be profitably used by all who have anything to do with "the greatest work in the world."

Professor John E. Stout has given us in his *Organization and Administration of Religious Education* one of the most useful manuals on the subject ever written. His assumption that whatever we would have in our national life we must first put into our program of education is open surely to little contradiction while few fail to sympathize with his assertion that one way to make the nation Christian is to make use of the educational method in religion, and of course for us, religion and Christianity are synonymous terms. Professor Stout tells us how to make a "program," how to organize the community for the study of the Bible and the religion for which the Bible is *the Book*; he explains to us the plan and work of community week-day schools for religious instruction, and of "church" schools; he advises us how to train teachers and how to supervise them; and he points out what should be kept in mind in the management of pupils. The closing chapter is devoted to the problem of religious teaching in our higher institutions of learning, and the last pages give a selected bibliography of the entire subject brought down to the present year.

The pastor who wishes a short manual for group discussions of the meaning of education when dominated by Christian methods and ideals cannot do better than use Dr. Clarke's *Education for Successful Living*. The presentation is brief; interesting, and stimulating in that it does not present merely the broad generalizations upon which pretty nearly everyone is agreed, but points out concrete details of application concerning which there can be differences of view. At the close of each chapter are given questions and topics "To think about." One good method would be to select from these what could be considered before reading the chapter and to assign them in advance by way of "pre-perception" of the topic.

Lincoln University, Pa.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

Christian Work as a Vocation. By HENRY HALLAM TWEEDY, HARLAN P. BEACH, JUDSON JACKSON McKIM. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. x, 44.

This is one of the "Christian Service Series" designed to meet the needs of those who, especially in colleges, are trying to attract young men and women to take up Christian service in the community as their life calling. It is written for use in "discussion-groups" connected with college or university Christian Associations. Professor Tweedy writes on The Ministry; Dr. Beach on The Foreign Missionary's Calling; and Mr. McKim on the Young Men's Christian Association. The book is well adapted to its purpose and will prove of value to the pastor and

teacher who wishes to work as well as pray the Lord of the vineyard to send the laborers into His vineyard.

Lincoln University, Pa.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

The Untried Civilization. By JOHN WILLIAM FRAZER, with an introduction by DR. JOHN FORT NEWTON. The Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati.

These essays have been called out by the unrest and confusion of these times of readjustment following the upheaval of the great war. The author well says that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is meant to touch and influence the whole life of men and nations and that the hope of future progress lies not only along the line of mechanical achievement and material prosperity but also of the practical application of the teachings of Jesus Christ to all questions raised by the mutual dealings of men and nations. How shall this be done? The author has no definite programme. There are but two ways in which men in the mass can be influenced and controlled: by force from without, or by influencing and controlling the individuals from within. The first was Napoleon's method of dealing with the mobs of Paris. It was effective but it did not prevent future outbreaks of mob violence; and in our day, the Prussian theory of subordinating the individual to the State and the Superman thus developed has proved an utter failure. The other is the method of the Puritan Reformation which changed all England by making it a nation of one Book.

The work of Mr. Frazer is helpful, in many places inspiring. Its weakness is in its emphasis of the 'larger' Gospel—the social gospel rather than the Christ who redeems from sin.

Ashbourne, Pa.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

GENERAL LITERATURE

The American Citizens and Their Government. By KENNETH COLGROVE, Associate Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University. The Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati.

This book grew out of a series of lectures delivered before a number of Chicago women to whom it is dedicated. One of the interesting things which have grown out of the suffrage granted to women is their determination to acquaint themselves with the methods and theories of government as well as the qualifications of candidates, and this makes the women's vote an unknown quantity and a terror to the boss and to the organization. It would be difficult to find a better text book for a class in American Government than these lectures of Professor Colgrove. High Schools will find here a practical work on civics.

The chapters are: The Origin of the American Constitution, National and State Constitutions, Citizenship, Method of Electing the President,

His Powers and Functions, Election of Congress and its Functions, the Courts, National and State, the State Government, County and Rural Government, etc.

Ashbourne, Pa.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

The Mythology of All Races. In thirteen volumes. LOUIS HERBERT GRAY, A.M., PH.D., Editor. *Latin-American.* By HARTLEY BERN ALEXANDER, PH.D., Professor of Philosophy, University of Nebraska. Volume XI. 8vo; pp. xvi, 424. Boston: Marshall Jones Company. 1920.

Other numbers of this splendid series have been reviewed as follows: Nos. 1, 6, 9, 10, in Vol. XV. and No. 12 in Vol. XVI. The present contribution would appear in all respects to equal the high standard of its predecessors.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The United States Department of Agriculture, A Study in Agriculture. Series XXXVIII. No. 1 Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Sciences under the Direction of the Department of History, Political Economy, and Political Sciences. By WILLIAM L. WANLASS, PH.D., Assistant Professor of Economics and Politics in Union College. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1920. 8vo; pp. vii, 131.

We are always glad to welcome these admirably careful and judicial Johns Hopkins publications, and it is not otherwise with this last of them to be received by us.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Translations of Christian Literature. Series I. Greek Texts: *Gregory Thaumaturgus' Address to Origen.* By W. METCALFE, B.D. Pp. 96. *The Library of Photius.* By J. H. FREESE. Vol. I. Pp. xiv, 243. *The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of Chrysostom.* By HERBERT MOORE. Pp. xxv, 213.

Philosophumena to the Refutation of All Heresies (Formerly attributed to Origen but now to Hippolytus, Bishop and Martyr who flourished about 220 A. D.). By F. LEGGE, F. S. A. Vol. I. Pp. vi, 180. London: Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1920, 1921.

Texts Explained, or Helps to Understand the New Testament. By DEAN F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F. R. S. New York: George H. Doran. 8vo. Pp. viii, 372. Price \$1.50.

The Coming of Coal. By ROBERT W. BRUERE, of the Bureau of Industrial Research. Prepared for The Educational Committee, Commission on the Church and Social Service of the Federal Council of Churches of

Christ in America. New York: The Association Press. 12 mo. Pp. 123. Price \$1.00.

Anecdotes About Soul Winning. Being a Selection of the Best Anecdotes About How to Win Souls, Gleaned from the Leading Religious Papers. By JAMES GILCHRIST LAWSON. Chicago: Glad Tidings Publishing Co. Leaflet, 15 cents.

Anecdotes About Giving. Being the Best Anecdotes About Christian Giving Gleaned from the Leading Religious Papers. By JAMES GILCHRIST LAWSON. Chicago: Glad Tidings Publishing Co. Leaflet, Price 10 cents.

John Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. xxxix, 3. xl, 1. xl, 2.

The International Molders Union of North America. By FRANK T. STOCKTON, PH.D., Professor of Economics, University of South Dakota. 8vo. Pp. 222.

The Presidential Campaign of 1832. By SAMUEL RHEA GAMMON, JR., PH.D., Professor of History in Austin College. 8vo. Pp. 180.

The Canadian Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. By CHARLES C. TANSILL, PH.D., Professor of American History, American University, Washington, D. C. 8vo. Pp. 96.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Third Series—Vol. I—1922. Part I. *The Journal and its Supplement.* Part II. *The Synodical and Presbyterial Rolls and The Statistical Tables.* Philadelphia: The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. June, August, 1922.

Les Penseurs de l'Islam. Par BARON CARRA DE VAUX. Tome I. *Les Souverains l'Histoire at la Philosophie politique;* Tome II. *Les Géographes, les Sciences mathématiques et naturelles.* Paris: Libraire Paul Geuthner. 1921. 12 mo. Pp. 383, 400. Prix 12 fr. 50 l'un.

The Return of Christ. By CHARLES R. ERDMAN, D.D., Professor of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary. With an introduction by REV. J. STUART HOLDEN, D.D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Portman Square, London. New York: George H. Doran. 12 mo. Pp. xiv, 108. Price \$1.00 net.

The Prohibition Question, Viewed from the Economic and Moral Standpoint. The views of hundreds of Leading Men of Affairs as expressed in letters to the *Manufacturers Record* in reply to a questionnaire on the subject. Baltimore: Manufacturers Record Publishing Co. 1922. Pp. 883. Price 50 cents a copy.

How Prohibition Works in American Cities. By DEETS PICKETT, Research Secretary of the Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With Foreword by BISHOP WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL. Washington, D. C.: Board of Temperance, etc. Methodist Episcopal Church. 1922. Pp. 64.

Korte Verklaring der Heilige Schrift: De Profeet Jesaja, opnieuw uit den Grondtekst vertaald en verklaard. Eerste Deel, Hoofdstuk 1-39. Door DR. J. RIDDERBOS, Hoogleraar aan de Theologische School. Kampen: J. Kok. 8vo. Pp. xviii, 175.

Tekst en Uitleg. Praktische Bijbelverklaring. II. Het Nieuwe Testament: De Handelingen der Apostelen. Door. DR. J. DE ZWAAN. Groningen, den Haag: J. B. Wolters. 8vo. Pp. 164.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Church Monthly, New York, July: WILLIAM A. SMITH, Necessary Guidance of the Present Revival of Interest in Prayer; JARED S. MOORE, Psychoanalysis: Its Values and Its Dangers; FREDERICK S. ARNOLD, American Lutheranism; JAMES H. FLYE, Purgatory: An Appeal to Reason; JOSEPH P. McCOMAS, Continuity of the Church. *The Same*, August: A. C. A. HALL, The Church; Its Nature and Authority; WALKER GWYNNE, Is Marriage ever Dissoluble during Life? BERNARD I. BELL, Church's Responsibility for Education; KENNETH R. FORBES, The Sacraments in the Light of Modern Psychology. *The Same*, September: FREDERICK S. ARNOLD, The New Religions; JOHN M. S. ALLISON, The Return to Medievalism; MARSHALL M. DAY, The Liturgical Drama; NEAL DOLSON, Self-Denial and Disease; JAMES H. FLYE, Can We Believe in Hell?; HAMILTON SCHUYLER, The Puritan Bodies.

American Journal of Philology, Baltimore, June: ROY J. DEFERRARI, St. Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons; A. G. LAIRA, When is Generic $\mu\eta$ Particular? EDWARD W. NICHOLS, Single Word versus Phrase; F. A. WRIGHT, Two Passages in Pindar; W. F. ALBRIGHT, Origin of the Name *Cilicia*; GUY B. DOLSON, Imprisoned English Authors and the Consolation of the Philosophy of Boethius; EDWIN H. TUTTLE, Derivatives of the Sanskrit *ēka*. *The Same*, September: ROY J. DEFERRARI, St. Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons (ii.); ARNOLD ROSETH, Die Entstehung des absoluten Infinitivs im Griechischen; HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB, Virginia Georgics; PAUL HAUPT, Biblical Studies; KATHERINE ALLEN, The Fasti of Ovid and the Augustan Propaganda.

Anglican Theological Review, New York, May: GEORGE ZABRISKIE, Prayer Book Revision; WINFRED DOUGLAS, A Note on the Roman *Schola Cantorum*; GEORGE C. STEWART, The Qualities of a Good Preacher; ALFRED H. SWEET, A Papal Visitation of Westminster in 1269.

Biblical Review, New York, July: LYNN THORNDIKE, Early Christianity and Natural Science; E. G. SIHLER, Disintegration of the Roman Empire and Augustine's City of God; ALBERT C. WYCKOFF, Mourners and Mediums; MORGAN W. VAN TASSELL, Remaking the Country Church; KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, Christianizing the Rural Community.

Bibliotheca Sacra, St. Louis, July: JOSEPH KYLE, The Doctrine of Sin; WILLIAM H. BATES, God's Forgiveness of Sin; CHARLES H. RICHARDS, Supremacy of the Spirit; JAMES LINDSAY, God and Personality; HENRY A. STIMSON, New England Theology: Its Historical Place; JAMES L.

KELSO, The Roman Influence in the New Testament; J. F. SPRINGER, Order of Events in Matthew and Mark.

Church Quarterly Review, London, July: J. B. SEATON, Religion in Czecho-Slovakia; W. LOCKTON, Origin of the Gospels; E. H. PEARCE, Worcester Priory and Its Bishop; HILDA D. OAKLEY, The New Idealism; F. P. CHEETHAM, Language and Style in the New Testament; ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, Report of the Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities.

East and West, London, July: GRAHAM ASPLAND, China and Opium Today; A. CROSTHWAITE, Conference of the Depressed Classes in India; A. S. CRIPPS, Dispossession in South Africa; R. P. WILDER, Student Volunteers; E. COURTENAY WEST, Mission of Help to India.

Expositor, London, July: JAMES MOFFATT, St. Luke and Literary Criticism; JOHN R. MACKAY, Benjamin B. Warfield: a Bibliography; W. F. LOFTHOUSE, The Call of Amos; W. J. FERRAR, Fatherhood of God; H. R. MACKINTOSH, Knowledge of God Mediated by Forgiveness; INNES LOGAN, A Sometimes Neglected Factor Illustrated. *The Same*, August: G. H. C. MACGREGOR, How far is the Fourth Gospel a Unity?; W. ERNEST BEET, The Message of the Book of Job; T. H. ROBINSON, The Golden Calf; F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, The Pleroma as the Medium of the Self-Realisation of Christ; A. D. MARTIN, The Sign of Jonah. *The Same*, September: GEORGE EDMUNDSON, Date of the Shepherd of Hermas; J. W. FALCONER, The Temptation; R. W. STEWART, The "Men" of the North; J. A. ROBERTSON, What is Now Meant by the Authority of Scripture?; J. A. KELSO, Water Libation in the Old Testament.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, June: Notes of Recent Exposition; C. J. GADD, Thirty Years' Progress in Assyriology; EDMUND D. JONES, Was Mark the Gardener of Gethsemane?; EDWARD GRUBB, The Raising of Lazarus; W. D. NIVEN, Two Commentaries on the Apocalypse. *The Same*, July: Notes of Recent Exposition; C. J. GADD, Thirty Years' Progress in Assyriology; RENDEL HARRIS, Pindar and St. Paul; A. H. SAYCE, Naville on the Pentateuch; W. D. NIVEN, Are the Gospels in Verse?; R. STRACHAN, 'The Man Borne of Four.' *The Same*, August: Notes of Recent Exposition; W. J. FERRAR, Modernism and the Person of Christ; ADOLF DEISSMANN, 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'; L. A. WADDELL, The Chaldee Father-God and the Pillar of Cloud; H. J. WOTHERSPOON, The Church as an Ethical Society.

Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, July: WILLARD L. SPERRY, The Call to the Ministry; GEORGE LA PIANA, Recent Tendencies in Roman Catholic Theology; MAX RADIN, Teknonymy in the Old Testament; ROBERT H. PFEIFFER, An Unknown Source of Luther's Theology; ROBERT P. BLAKE, Macler's Armenian Gospels.

Homiletic Review, New York, July: LESTER G. SIMON, Vagabonding in Bookland; WESLEY R. WELLS, Is Human Nature Good or Bad?; ERIC LEWIS, Scriptural Meaning of "Destroy," "Perish"; HENRY H. BARSTOW, Is the Church Membership System Churchly?; H. MALDWYN

HUGHES, The Only Cure for Dissatisfaction. *The Same*, August: DAVID R. PIPER, Is the Community Church a Fad?; EDUARD KONIG, Religious and Ethical Conditions and Outlook in Germany; RALPH B. LARKIN, The Enchanted Ground of Imagination; FREDERICK J. GURNEY, Evolution, the Bible, and Religion. *The Same*, September: CLAUDE S. HANBY, Drama of Job; JOHN W. BUCKHAM, Bible Teaching Concerning Creation; CHARLES A. DINSMORE, The Minister's Use of Fiction; JAMES MOFFATT, About It and About; The Church and the Public Conscience.

Journal of Negro History, Washington, July: FRED LANDON, The Anderson Fugitive Case; G. DAVID HOUSTON, A Negro Senator; HARRY S. BLACKISTON, Lincoln's Emancipation Plan; L. N. FEIPEL, Journal of Isaaco.

Journal of Religion, Chicago, July: PAUL HUTCHINSON, Conservative Reaction in China; EDWARD L. SCHAUB, Present Status of the Psychology of Religion; GEORGE CROSS, Motive of Theology; WORTH M. TIPPY, Value of the Social Survey for Religion; KENNETH J. SAUNDERS, Sketches of Buddhism as a Living Religion.

Journal of the Society of Oriental Research, Chicago, April: SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Divine Service in the Old Kingdom; JOHN A. MAYNARD, A Penitential Litany from Ashur; FRIEDRICH HROZNY, Das hethitische Königspaar Tlabarnaš und Tavannannaš; JOHN A. MAYNARD, A Fourth Bibliographical Survey of Assyriology (1921).

Journal of Theological Studies, London, July: J. BESSIÈRES, La Tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Saint Basile (vi); F. J. BADCOCK, The Old Roman Creed; J. W. TYRER, Prayer of St. Polycarp and its concluding Doxology; H. A. WILSON, Reconstruction of Hadrian's Sacramentary; F. S. MARSH, New Fragment of the Gospel (?) of Bartholomew; G. R. DRIVER, Notes on Hebrew Lexicography; F. C. BURKITT, Pelagius and his Work.

London Quarterly Review, London, July: WALTER LOCK, The Fourth Gospel; M. McDONNELL BODKIN, Appeal of the Supernatural; W. T. DAVISON, Faith of a Philosopher; R. WINBOULT HARDING, Is a Creed Necessary or Desirable?; F. W. ORDE WARD, The Gospel with Wings; JOHN TELFORD, Queen Elizabeth and her Maids of Honour.

Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, July: CHARLES M. JACOBS, The Church and the Times; HENRY E. JACOBS, What is a Real Lutheran Hymn?; LOYAL H. LARIMER, How shall we Judge the Old Testament?; JOHN C. SEEGER, Evangelical Evangelism; ROBERT C. HORN, Notes on New Testament Greek; ALBERT T. W. STEINHAUSER, Petrine Elements in Mark's Gospel; FRANKLIN K. FRETZ, The Church and her Approach to the Social Problem; HENRY OFFERMAN, The Sin Against the Holy Ghost; JOHN C. MATTES, Liturgical Decline in Germany after the Reformation.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, July: L. S. KEYSER, Professor David H. Bauslin, D.D., LL.D.; a Biographical Sketch; L. H. LARIMER, The Eternal Value of the Life of Professor David H. Bauslin; VICTOR G. A. TRESSLER, Handling the New Testament; J. L. NEVE,

The Lutheran Church and the Federal Council; LEANDER S. KEYSER, Problem of New Testament Sources.

Methodist Quarterly Review, Nashville, July: SALEM G. BLAND, Christ Preëminent; JOHN J. TIGERT, Religious Education: the Need of the World Today; JAMES M. DIXON, Essential Value of Religion in College and University Training; C. P. ATKINSON, Personalism in Ethics; C. BRIDENTHAL, Place of the Preacher in the Building of a New World; JOHN A. FAULKNER, The Famous Galileo Case; LESTER WEAVER, Possible Church-College Achievements in Curriculum Construction; GUY V. PRICE, Some Social Results of the Protestant Reformation; G. B. WINTON, "The Reconstruction of Religion."

Moslem World, New York, July: PAUL W. HARRISON, The Arab Mind and the Gospel; ARTHUR JEFFERY, Eclecticism in Islam; S. RALPH HARLOW, Community Life and Ceremonies of the Peasant Turk; SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, The So-Called *Hadith Qudsi*; PERCY SMITH, The Ibadhites; M. CAY, Off the Beaten Track.

New Church Life, Lancaster, July: GEORGE DE CHARMS, The Lord's Perception; JAMES F. BUSS, Women as Preachers. *The Same*, August: FRANK WILSON, Serving the Church; ALEC SARGEANT, Doctrine of Degrees; HAROLD KUHL, Growth of the Church. *The Same*, September: F. E. GYLLENHAAL, The Second Coming of the Lord; GILBERT H. SMITH, The Name "New Jerusalem"; JOHN E. BOWERS, Reminiscences concerning the Honorable John Young.

Open Court, Chicago, June: J. V. NASH, A Twentieth Century Emancipator; VICTOR S. YARROS, Remaking Minds and Morals; T. V. SMITH, Democracy as a Form of Experimentalism; HARDIN T. MCCLELLAND, The Thing Called Civilization; MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN, Supernaturalism and Satanism in Chateaubriand; T. B. STORK, Economic Significance of High Prices. *The Same*, July: ARTHUR L. KEITH, Vergil's Conception of Fate; ELBRIDGE COLBY, Religion and Politics in Early Persia; HARRY E. BARNES, Political and Social Philosophy of Auguste Comte. *The Same*, August: KIANG SHAO-YUEN, Philosophy of Tang-Szu-Tung; F. W. FITZPATRICK, The "Law of Progress"; DON. W. LEET, Gautama, the Buddha; Jesus, the Christ; A. H. GODBEY, "Moses" and other Titles; HARRY E. BARNES, Political and Social Philosophy of Comte (ii).

Reformed Church Review, Lancaster, July: GEORGE W. RICHARDS, A Credible Creed; JOHN BAILLIE, Fundamental Task of the Theological Seminary; A. E. DAHLMANN, Relation of Dogma to Faith and Life; A. E. TRUXAL, A Study in Psychology; A. S. ZERBE, Doctrine of the Supernatural Conception of Jesus Christ; ARTHUR C. THOMPSON, The Bible in Modern Life.

Review and Expositor, Louisville, July: BENJAMIN W. BACON, Immortality in the Synoptic Gospels; FRANK C. PORTER, Paul's Belief in Life After Death; A. L. VAIL, What Made the Captain's Faith so Great?; S. ANGUS, The Church's Choice; JOHN W. JOHNSON, Pre-

requisites to the Understanding of the System of Theology of Augustus Hopkins Strong.

Southwestern Journal of Theology, Seminary Hill, July: M. E. DAVIS, Christ, God's Final Revelation; R. T. BRYAN, Girls and Women of China; B. H. CARROLL, Our Articles of Faith; W. E. DENHAM, Lecture on Genesis; H. E. DANA, History of the Word "Church."

Union Seminary Review, Richinond, July: WALTER L. LINGLE, Charleston Assembly; NEAL L. ANDERSON, Evolution as a Science and a Philosophy; B. C. PATTERSON, Devolution not Evolution; THOMAS K. YOUNG, Preach the Word; COTHRAN G. SMITH, The Seventeenth Street Mission.

Yale Review, New Haven, July: WALTER LIPPMANN, Second-Best Statesmen; FRANCIS W. HIRST, The Eclipse of Europe; FORD M. HUEFFER, A Haughty and Proud Generation; EDWIN G. CONKLIN, Future of Evolution; WILLOWDEAN C. HANDY, The Marquesans: Fact versus Fiction; HENRY P. FAIRCHILD, The End of Race Migrations.

Biblica, Roma, 3:3: A. TRICOT, La Prise d'Aï; L. MURILLO, El veredicto de S. Pablo sobre la religiosidad del paganismo; A. MERCATI, Per la storia del Codice Amiatino; F. PELSTER, Echtheitsfragen bei den exegetischen Schriften des hl. Thomas von Aquin; J. VILAR, Petri de Ribadeneyra e S. I. paraphrasis nonnullorum psalmorum manu scripta; A. VACCARI, Victorini in Apocalypsim editio princeps.

Bilychnis, Roma, Margio: B. VARISCO, Come riformarsi?; A. V. MÜLLER, Il Dr. Paulus di Monaco, il Beato Fidati e Lutero; W. MONOD, Esempio di tolleranza cristiana. *The Same*, Giugno: A. NEPPI MODONA, L'Apologia di Aristide e il nuovo frammento d'Ossirinco; C. JALLA, I legati papali a Trento alla III convocazione del Concile sotto Pio IV; E. TAGLIALATELA, Efficacia inconscia. *The Same*, Lug.-Agosto: A. CHIAPELLI, Il nuovo idealismo teistico; A. NEPPI MODONA, L'innologia cristiana primitiva; C. JALLA, I legati papali a Trento alla III convocazione del Concilio sotto Pio IV.

Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, Aalten, Mei: G. CH. AALDERS, Ezra's reformatie en de pentateuchkwesitie; L. LINDEBOOM, Onze studenten; C. LINDEBOOM, Jansen's verklaring van de Kerkorde. *The Same*, Juni: J. RIDDERBOS, Jesaja's verkondiging aangaande God; G. KEIZER, Het derde ambt der ouderlingen; A. A. VAN SCHELVEN, Een Tegenhanger. *The Same*, Juli: G. KEIZER, Het derde ambt der ouderlingen; N. D. VAN LEEUWEN, Jahve-Marduk. *The Same*, Augustus: C. BOUMA, Nieuwere literatuur over en commentaren op het N. T.

Logos, Napoli, Aprile-Giugno: P. SERINI, Emilio Boutroux; G. DELLA VALLE, La misura intensiva del valore; E. DI CARLO, Teoria filosofica del diritto; A. ALIOTTA, Il mio relativismo; B. STUMPO, Il significato del Prometeo di Eschilo.

Nieuwe Theologische Studien, Groningen, V:5/6: J. TH. UBBINK, Jh. 51, "Een Feest" of "Het Paaschfeest"?; J. TH. UBBINK, Zijn gelofte vervuld; H. H. MEULENBELT, Lk. 6:1 En sabbattooi Deuteroprootooi; A. VAN VELDHUIZEN, Uit het Nieuwe Testament; G. v. D.

LEUW, *Uit de Godsdienstgeschiedenis*; W. J. AALDERS, *Godsdienst en kerk in Amerika*.

Revue d'Ascetique et de Mystique, Paris, Juillet: R. DAESCHLER, *Un Témoin de la "Tradition Mystique"* le P. Judde; L. REYFENS, *Le sommet de la contemplation mystique chez le Jean de Ruusbroec*; A. FARGES, *La manière de poser la question mystique*; P. GUILLoux, *L'ascétisme de Clement d'Alexandrie*.

Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, Strasbourg, Mai-Juin: M. LEENHARDT, *Notes sur la traduction du Nouveau Testament en langue primitive*; ROD. REUSS, *Un candidat en théologie alsacien à Paris en 1827-1828*; C. BLONDEL, *La Psychanalyse*.

Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne, Avril-Juin: ALOYS FORNEROD, *Le Christ de l'histoire et le Christ des consciences*; JEAN DE LA HARPE, *L'idée de contingence dans la philosophie d'Emile Boutroux*; CHARLES DURAND-PALLOT, *Le problème de l'origine de la souffrance et ses répercussions sur la vie chrétienne*.

Revue des Sciences et Theologiques, Paris, Juillet: A. LEMONNYER, *Le Messianisme des "Béatitudes"*; R.-M. MARTIN, *Les Idées de Robert de Melun sur le péché originel*; G. SCHMIDT, *Le sacrifice chez les primitifs, d'après M. Loisy*.

Rivista Trimestrale di Studi Filosofici e Religiosi, Perugia, iii: 2: E. BUONAIUTI, *Luigi Duchesne*; G. FURLANI, *Sul trattato di Sergio di Rêsh'aynâ circa le categorie*; A. PINI, *Modernismo anglicano*; A. BONUCCI, *Soggetto e Spazio-Tempo*.

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Tübingen, 30: 4: THEODOR HAERING, *Ist unsere Sündhaftigkeit unsere persönliche Schuld?*; RUDOLF OTTO, *Zum Verhältnis von mystischer und gläubiger Frömmigkeit*; RUDOLF PAULUS, *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Grundlagen des Glaubens*.

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Innsbruck, xlv: 3: AUGUST DENEFFE, *Geschichte des Wortes "supernaturalis"*; FRANZ PELSTER, *Thomas von Sutton, ein Oxfordter Verteidiger der thomistischen Lehre (ii)*; URBAN HOLZMEISTER, *Die Magdalenenfrage in der kirchlichen Überlieferung*.

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR THE
FACULTY

J. ROSS STEVENSON
JOHN D. DAVIS
WM. BRENTON GREENE, JR.
ROBERT DICK WILSON
CHARLES R. ERDMAN
J. RITCHIE SMITH
J. GRESHAM MACHEN
OSWALD T. ALLIS

FRANCIS L. PATTON
JOHN DEWITT
GEERHARDUS VOS
WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG
FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER
CASPAR WISTAR HODGE
HENRY W. SMITH
FINLEY D. JENKINS

JOSEPH H. DULLES

BY
OSWALD T. ALLIS

VOLUME XX
1922

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

NOTES AND NOTICES

THE SHORTER BIBLE—THE OLD TESTAMENT. By John Fox.....	118
MEDEBA OR THE WATERS OF RABBAH. By John D. Davis.....	305
EZEKIEL'S SANCTUARY AND WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY. By C. M. MACKAY	661

BOOKS REVIEWED

ALEXANDER, H. B., <i>The Mythology of All Races: Latin American</i>	693
AMES, F. JR., <i>American Red Cross Work Among the French People</i>	346
ARNOLD-FOSTER, F., <i>The Hymn Book of the Church or the Growth of the Psalter</i>	497
ATHEARN, W. S., <i>A National System of Education</i>	516
BACON, B. W., <i>Is Mark a Roman Gospel?</i>	326
BAKER, E. D. and C. B., <i>The Bible in Graded Study</i>	689
BAKEWELL, C. M., <i>The Story of the American Red Cross in Italy</i>	346
BALFOUR, A. J., <i>Essays Speculative and Political</i>	133
BARKER, C. B. and KOHLSAAL, C., <i>Songs for the Little Children</i> ...	519
BARTLET, J. V. and CARLYLE, A. J., <i>Christ in History</i>	337
BARTON, W. E., <i>Four Hitherto Unpublished Gospels</i>	519
BASHFORD, J. W., <i>The Demand for Christ</i>	524
BERTHOLET, A., <i>Kulturgeschichte Israels</i>	674
BETTS, A. F., <i>The Mother Teacher of Religion</i>	690
BETTS, G. H., <i>The New Program of Religious Education</i>	689
BIEDERWULF, W. E., <i>Evangelism, Its Justification, its Operation and its Value</i>	518
BOREHAM, F. W., <i>The Home of the Echoes</i>	351
BOUNDS, E. M., <i>Prayer and Praying Men</i>	348
BOUNDS, E. M., <i>The Ineffable Glory: Thoughts on the Resurrection</i>	348
BOUQUET, A. C., <i>Is Christianity the Final Religion?</i>	311
BROWN, C. R., <i>The Religion of a Layman</i>	685
BURTON, E. D., <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians</i>	142
BUTTENWIESER, M., <i>The Book of Job</i>	671
CADBURY, H. J., <i>The Style and Literary Method of Luke</i>	329
CADMAN, S. P., <i>Ambassadors of God</i>	685
CANNEY, M. A., <i>An Encyclopedia of Religion</i>	668
CARRINGTON, P., <i>Christian Apologetics of the Second Century</i>	487
CASE, F. H., <i>Handbook of Christian Advertising</i>	159
CHAMBERLAIN, H. S., <i>Mensch und Gott</i>	327
CHANDLER, A., <i>Faith, Works and Grace. Addresses on the Seven Words from the Cross</i>	157
CHIMINELLI, P., <i>Bibliographia della Storia Riforma Religiosa in Italia</i>	505

CHRISMAN, L. H., <i>John Ruskin, Preacher, and Other Essays</i>	520
<i>Church and Industrial Reconstruction, The</i>	349
CLARK, C. A., <i>First Fruits in Korea</i>	349
CLARKE, J. E., <i>Education for Successful Living</i>	690
COLGROVE, K., <i>The American Citizens and their Government</i>	692
COPE, H. F., <i>Education for Democracy</i>	516
CRAIN, T. C. T., <i>Some Pleas for Adequate Religious Instruction</i> <i>for the Young</i>	159
CROSBY, L. L., <i>The Geography of Bible Lands</i>	518
DALRYMPLE, D., <i>The Mantle of Elijah</i>	522
DEWULF, M., <i>Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages</i>	666
EASTMAN, F., <i>Unfinished Business of the Presbyterian Church in</i> <i>America</i>	347
ECKENSTEIN, L., <i>A History of Sinai</i>	672
ECKMAN, G. P., <i>The Return of the Redeemer</i>	341
FARIS, W. W., <i>The Christian Home</i>	352
FERRERO, G., <i>The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph</i> <i>of Christianity</i>	508
FLEWELLING, R. T., <i>Bergson and Personal Realism</i>	482
FOSDICK, H. E., <i>The Meaning of Service</i>	137
FOWLER, H. T., <i>Great Leaders of Hebrew History—From Monasseh</i> <i>to John the Baptist</i>	503
FOXELL, W. J., <i>The Temptation of Jesus</i>	495
FRAYSER, N. L., <i>Followers of the Marked Trail</i>	158
FRAZER, J. W., <i>The Untried Civilization</i>	692
FYFE, G. B., <i>The Passing Legions</i>	346
GARVIE, A. E., <i>The Christian Preacher</i>	344
GOOD, J. I., <i>Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian</i> <i>Churches</i>	139
GOOD, J. I., <i>The Reformed Reformation</i>	139
GRANT, F. C., <i>The Life and Times of Jesus</i>	157
GRAY, A. H., <i>The Christian Adventure</i>	156
GREENE, J. N., <i>The Portrait of the Prodigal. Life Stories in Ex-</i> <i>periences of the Prodigal Son.</i>	154
GUILD, R. B., <i>Community Programs for Coöperating Churches</i> ..	517
HALL, W. H., <i>The Near East: Crossroads of the World</i>	528
HARDEN, J. M., <i>Dictionory of the Vulgate New Testament</i>	336
HARRIS, C., <i>My Son</i>	157
HASTINGS, J., ED., <i>The Children's Great Texts of the Bible</i>	342
HORSCH, J., <i>Modern Religious Liberalism</i>	135
HOUGH, L. H., <i>The Eyes of Faith</i>	685
HOYT, A. S., <i>The Pulpit and American Life</i>	155
HÜGEL, F. VON, <i>Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion</i>	314
HUNGERFORD, E., <i>With the Doughboy in France</i>	346
HUTTON, J. A., <i>That the Ministry be Not Blamed</i>	525
<i>In Memoriam</i>	158
JACKS, L. P., <i>From Authority to Freedom. The Spiritual Pilgrim-</i> <i>age of Charles Hargrove</i>	150

JONES, M., <i>The Four Gospels</i>	493
JOWETT, J. H., " <i>Come Ye Apart.</i> "	523
KELMAN, J., <i>The Foundations of Faith</i>	312
KING, H. C., <i>A New Mind for the New Age</i>	153
LINDBERG, C. E., <i>Christian Dogmatics and Notes on the History of Dogma</i>	682
LITTLE, E. F., <i>What Must the Church Do to be Saved?</i>	343
McCLURE, H., <i>The Contents of the New Testament</i>	517
McCONNELL, F. J., <i>Church Finance and Social Ethics</i>	159
McCONNELL, F. J., <i>Public Opinion and Theology</i>	683
McDOWALL, S. A., <i>Beauty and the Beast: An Essay in Evolutionary Aesthetic</i>	482
MAINS, G. P., <i>United States Citizenship</i>	351
MATHEWS, B., <i>The Argonauts of Faith</i>	352
MATHEWS, S. and SMITH, G. B., <i>A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics</i>	484
MATTERN, J., <i>The Employment of the Plebiscite in the Determin- ation of Sovereignty</i>	161
MEAD, G. W., <i>The Great Menace: Americanism or Bolshevism?</i>	136
MILBURN, R. G., Ed., <i>Law's Serious Call</i>	524
MILLER, P. H., <i>Our Reasonable Faith</i>	683
MITCHELL, B., <i>The Rise of Cotton in the South</i>	529
NICOLL, W. R., <i>Princes of the Church</i>	687
OMAN, J., <i>The Paradox of the World</i>	520
OTTOMAN, F. C., <i>The Coming Day</i>	342
<i>Painted Windows, Studies in Religious Personality</i>	513
PARRY, R. ST. J., <i>The Pastoral Epistles</i>	490
PECK, G. C., <i>Cross-Lots and Other Essays</i>	521
PRATT, J. B., <i>The Religious Consciousness. A Psychological Study</i>	316
PYM, T. W., <i>Psychology and the Christian Life</i>	488
QUAYLE, W. A., <i>The Uncommon Commonplace</i>	522
QUILLER-COUCH, A., <i>On the Art of Reading</i>	160
RANDALL, J. H., <i>The New Light on Immortality, or The Signifi- cance of Psychic Research</i>	133
RICE, M. S., <i>Dust and Destiny</i>	525
ROBINSON, A. P., <i>The Wonderful Christ</i>	687
ROBINSON, J. S., <i>The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers</i>	529
ROGERS, R. W., <i>Great Characters of the Old Testament</i>	499
ROLBECKI, J. J., <i>The Political Philosophy of Dante Alighieri</i>	483
ROLT, C. E., <i>The Spiritual Body</i>	487
RYAN, A. L., <i>When we Join the Church</i>	352
SCHOFF, W. H., <i>The Ship "Tyre," A Study in the Commerce of the Bible</i>	678
SCHULZE, M., <i>Grundriss der evangelischen Dogmatik</i>	148
SCHUMACHER, H., <i>Christus in seiner Präexistenz und Kenose nach Phil. 2, 5-8.</i>	680

SCHUMACHER, H., <i>Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Matt. II, 27</i> (<i>Luc 10, 22</i>)	678
SCOTT, E. F., <i>The New Testament Today</i>	330
SHELDON, C. M., <i>In His Steps Today</i>	158
SHELDON, H. C., <i>Studies in Recent Adventism</i>	150
SIMPSON, H. L., <i>The Intention of His Soul. Essays for the Un- theologically Minded</i>	684
SIMPSON, K., <i>The Capitalization of Good Will</i>	161
SMITH, C. R., <i>The Bible Doctrine of Society in its Historical Evolution</i>	315
SMITH, W. W., <i>A Theory of the Mechanism of Survival</i>	139
SNOWDEN, J. H., <i>The Meaning of Education</i>	689
STAERCK, W., <i>Lyrick (Psalmen, Hoheslied und Verwandtes), über- setzt und erklärt</i>	678
STEPHAN, H., <i>Glaubenslehre: Der evangelische Glaube und seine Welt Anschauung</i>	509
STERRETT, J. M., <i>Modernism in Religion</i>	682
STEVENS, J. S., <i>The English Bible</i>	517
STOCKDALE, F. B., <i>The Future Life, Fact and Fancies</i>	669
STOCKMAN, P. J., <i>Manual of Christian Perfection</i>	348
STOUT, J. E., <i>Organization and Administration of Religious Educa- tion</i>	690
STRONG, A. H., <i>What Shall I Believe? A Primer of Christian Theology</i>	681
SWAIN, R. L., <i>What and Where is God?—A Human Answer to the Deep Religious Cry of the Modern Soul.</i>	134
TRACY, F., <i>The Psychology of Adolescence</i>	689
TWEEDY, H. H., BEACH, H. P., and McKIM, J. J., <i>Christian Work as a Vocation</i>	691
VOLZ, P., <i>Das Buch Hiob, Sprüche und Jesus Sirach, Prediger, übersetzt und erklärt.</i>	678
WANLASS, W. L., <i>A Study in Agriculture</i>	693
WATKINSON, W. L., <i>The Shepherd of the Sea and Other Sermons</i> WEBB, A., <i>One Thousand Evangelistic Illustrations</i>	521
WEIR, T. H., <i>The Variants in the Gospel Reports</i>	523
WELLS, H. G., <i>The Outline of History, Being a Plain History of Life and Mankind</i>	333
WHITE, C. T., <i>Lincoln and Prohibition</i>	161
WHITE, H. G. E., <i>The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus</i>	351
WHYTE, A., <i>Lord, Teach us to Pray.</i>	334
WILLIAMS, H. B., <i>Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought</i>	688
WOOD, I. E., <i>The Heroes of Early Israel.</i>	669
WRONG, G. M., <i>The United States and Canada</i>	319
WYCKOFF, A. C., <i>The Non-Sense of Christian Science.</i>	528
ZIETHE, W., <i>Hold Fast That Which Thou Hast</i>	526
	159

CONTRIBUTORS

- ALISON, J., 346-347.
 ALLIS, O. T., 319-326, 499-505, 671-677, 678.
 BLAIR, H., 349-351.
 BURRELL, D. J., 69-77.
 CLOW, W. M., 647-660.
 CRAIG, S. G., 15-40, 312-314.
 DAVIS, J. D., 305-310.
 DEININGER, C. F., 497-499, 677.
 DOSKER, H. E., 448-464.
 DOWNS, F. S., 287-304.
 ERDMAN, C. R., 157-159, 347-348, 352-353, 517-520.
 FOX, J., 118-132.
 GAGE, D. S., 161-169, 666-667.
 GREENE, W. B., JR., 133-139, 157, 161, 311, 314-316, 487-490, 529, 537-561, 669-671, 693.
 HENDERSON, G. H., 475-481.
 HODGE, C. W., 1-14, 148-150, 341-342, 348, 509-513, 681-683.
 HOLLIDAY, W. A., 78-92.
 JOHNSON, G., 316-319, 516-517, 689-692.
 JOHNSON, W. H., 482, 484-487, 508-509, 562-584.
 LOETSCHER, F. W., 139-142, 337-341, 505-508.
 MACARTNEY, C. E., 150-154, 232-262, 361-374, 513-515, 687-688.
 MACHEN, J. G., 93-117, 142-148, 326-336, 490-497.
 MACKAY, C. M., 399-417, 661-665.
 MONTGOMERY, R., 349, 351-352, 528-529, 692-693.
 PAIST, B. F., JR., 212-231, 418-447, 528, 616-646.
 PITZER, R. C., 375-398.
 PRICE, G. M., 585-615.
 RAMSAY, F. P., 348-349, 482-483.
 SCHAFF, D. S., 263-286, 483-484.
 SHELDON, H. C., 41-56.
 SMITH, H. W., 160.
 SMITH, J. R., 154-157, 342-346, 520-526, 683-687.
 STEINER, B. C., 465-474.
 STEVENSON, J. R., 668-669, 688-689.
 TOMKINS, D. B., 526-528.
 VAN BAALen, J. K., 678-681.
 WILSON, R. D., 57-68, 177-211.

Articles are indicated by black-faced type: Notes and Notices by italics.

THE ORIGIN OF PAUL'S RELIGION

By J. GRESHAM MACHEN. The James Sprunt Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921. Cloth; 8vo. Price \$3.00.

"It is not often that we have had the privilege of reviewing a book, dealing with so important a theme, so worthy of praise both as regards its scholarship and its literary excellence."—Samuel G. Craig, in *The Presbyterian*.

"An able, impartial, and altogether very valuable discussion of the sources and nature of the Pauline theology . . ."—*The Expository Times*.

"Professor Machen has published a book which has a place and value of its own. His eight chapters are a sustained, trenchant argument . . ." James Moffatt, in *The British Weekly*.

THE RETURN OF CHRIST

By CHARLES R. ERDMAN. New York: George H. Doran Company. Crown 8vo. pp. xiv, 108. Price \$1.00.

As the author states, "the purpose of this book is to deepen conviction and to promote harmony of belief concerning the return of Christ." The doctrine is treated not as "the foundation" but as "the capstone of the Christian faith." The writer "does not attempt to explain mysteries . . . he emphasizes the cardinal truth that the great duty resting upon all those who accept the Lord Jesus Christ . . . is to preach 'this gospel of the kingdom in all the world . . . and then shall the end come.'"—*The Moravian*.

THE WALL AND THE GATES

By J. RITCHIE SMITH. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1919. 8vo., pp. 278. Price \$1.50 net.

"Some Sermons are edifying and some are otherwise. This book belongs emphatically in the former class. There is instruction, consolation, enthusiasm, encouragement, visions and foundations for everyone. To glance at its table of contents inspires hope; a perusal of its pages deepens faith, and to sit with it for an evening makes one feel stronger and nearer to his Master when he gets down upon his knees. There is scholarship and literature in happy combination. The Scriptures are richly interpreted and the spirituality of the book will commend it to all who love God."—*The United Presbyterian*.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

A Discussion of the Historical Questions. By ROBERT DICK WILSON. New York and London: G. F. Putnam's Sons; The Knickerbocker Press, 1917. 8vo, pp. xvi, 402. Price, \$3.50.

"It is difficult within a short space to give an adequate account of the way in which Professor Wilson acquits himself in the task of meeting all the objections that adroit and learned combatants have been alleging with a view to undermine faith in the historical character of Daniel and his prophecies. He seems always to take the statements of some at least of the Higher Critics almost more seriously than the critics themselves, and then institutes an inquiry about as thorough as in the nature of the case is possible, with the result that the conclusion is forced upon us that after all the Destructive Critics have mistaken their own *ipse dixit* for evidence, and baseless assumptions for the conclusions of an inductive science."—John R. Mackay, in *The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland*.